

THE
CHURCH QUARTERLY REVIEW.

N^o LXVI. JANUARY 1892.

ART. I.—GORE'S 'BAMPTON LECTURES.'

The Incarnation of the Son of God: being the Bampton Lectures for the year 1891. By CHARLES GORE, M.A., Principal of Pusey House; Fellow of Trinity College, Oxford. (London, 1891.)

A LIVING theologian has written, 'Many who know of no other sentence in' the writings of Augustine 'are familiar with the saying, "Thou, Lord, hast made us for Thyself, and therefore our hearts are restless until they rest in Thee."¹ Such a fact is significant. The desire to know and be united with God is deep-seated in man. Its influence is not confined to the many who consciously use it as the governing force of practical life; it sometimes strongly sways those who do not realize its presence; often it breaks out in the strangest and most distorted forms; it is an instinct which a true system of thought may be expected to satisfy. Thus, there is a reason, apart from other arguments, for the serious consideration of any belief which affords an adequate explanation of facts so widely found. For the study of the long history of human life shows the existence of a side of man's being which calls for development, and which cannot be developed except when it is raised towards a power higher than himself.

I. The Incarnation of the eternal Son of God is regarded by Christians as the Divine answer to human need.² And it may be worth while to trace out how in the Incarnation

¹ Bright, *Lessons from the Lives of Three Great Fathers*, p. 114, quoting from St. Aug. *Confess.* i. 1.

² See, e.g. St. Athan. *Orat. c. Arian.* ii. 54: Προηγείται γὰρ τοῦ γενέσθαι αὐτὸν ἀνθρώπου ἢ τῶν ἀνθρώπων χρεία. The idea is frequently found in Christian writers.

separate needs which are felt by man are satisfied. For besides that general sense of unrest in mind which is an indication that man is made for an eternal future and to serve an infinite being, there are definite wants which are either the instinctive feelings of mankind or the results of a thoughtful study of the world.

We shall hardly be wrong in saying that the first great want is forgiveness. A thinker who regards all existing religions as untrue has said that 'the propitiatory element' 'is the primary element'¹ which the scientific investigation of religious thought and practice discovers, and the statement of such a writer, however involved in misconceptions in his treatment of it, may serve as a witness that the desire for propitiation exists where it has not been artificially destroyed. A conviction of sin, real, if vague, may be seen to underlie all that is grotesque and pitiable in numerous sacrificial rites. The hopelessness which is a marked characteristic of educated heathen thought is the outcome of a mental burden of which sin is the real cause. Growth in spiritual sensitiveness and true desire for right bring with them a demand for healing. The human race, in the different stages of its development, pleads to be forgiven, and the Incarnation, while it does also a great deal more, supplies the possibility of forgiveness being received without a diminution of the holiness of God or a degradation of man.

Man desires to know the truth. Indifference to knowledge is a mark of crippled faculties. The persistent questions of many children unveil one side of their real nature. Patient study is the expression of a need. Wayward thought and mental independence carried to a harmful extreme are often indications of a wish to be emancipated from mistake. The yearning to know may sometimes show itself in forms as grotesque, as pitiable, as startling as the desire for propitiation, but even these are signs of the existence of an instinct which seeks to learn. Such a craving is real, and the Incarnate life, as it is a movement towards forgiveness, is also a revelation of truth.

The heart longs to be loved and to devote itself. The hardened condition and dwarfed conceptions of those who have no realization of love in others, and no sacrifice in their own lives, present nature's own testimony that human life is marred when it is not loved and it does not sacrifice. The power of kindness to win and to influence even the most de-

¹ H. Spencer, *Principles of Sociology*, pt. vi. ('Ecclesiastical Institutions'), p. 821.

graded shows how man's nature desires to feel itself the object of care. From the most unexpected quarters there is response in service which indicates, in however elementary a form, the wish for dedication. The great sacrifices in religious rites and in secular life of savage families and more civilized heathen soldiers and serious theists are signs of a hold on the idea of surrender. In the varying histories of widely differing peoples the craving for love, and the impulse to devotion, assume forms as perverted as those of the instincts we have already mentioned, but they really exist. And as they grow and are developed they are not satisfied with any finite source and object. In their higher forms they claim to receive a care in which there shall be no failure, and they desire to give a surrender which may be complete. They look for a gift which is perfect, and they yearn to bestow one in entire trust. They find what they need in the Incarnation, which tells of God's love and calls for a human response.

The Incarnation is more than the prelude to forgiveness, the revelation of truth, the witness to love, the demand for surrender. If it was only these, it would not supply a positive and objective power, and actually unite man and God. The possession of human nature by the Divine Son affords the link whereby the powers of God are really communicated to man, so far as man is capable of receiving them, and whereby real union is effected. The Incarnation creates the possibility of Sacraments. Sacraments convey Divine grace and unite the giver and the recipient. Here, again, the Incarnation is satisfying to human need. Man's thirst for love and desire to give himself seek to be completed in union; his sense of weakness calls for Divine grace. At each stage of his life, as an ideal is placed before him, he feels it above him, beyond his strength. As his instincts demand a power outside himself, higher than himself, his reasoned self-knowledge requires an objective gift of grace.

As man considers his history and examines himself, he is conscious of limits to his satisfaction which must necessarily exist in the present life. A body subject to weariness and disease, a mind which is not always clear and may suddenly fail, spiritual powers which are affected by body and mind, and which sometimes have to spend part of their energy in quelling or stimulating one or both—these teach an attentive inquirer that a belief which is really to satisfy human thought must speak of a perfection greater than can now be obtained. And here comes in a special feature of the Incarnation. As it makes possible union with the Incarnate, so it promises

likeness to Him.¹ And the likeness may be expected to include, in the case of men, as in the case of the God-Man, that through death their human nature will be raised to a higher state, capable of complete satisfaction now beyond its reach.² The necessary failure of the present life to supply all the felt needs of man is the witness of human nature itself to the probability of a fuller life, and the Incarnation is the promise that what now is lacking shall be hereafter received in the consummation of our union with God.³

We may be asked: Do you not forget wrong desires which human nature often allows and dark stains on the history of the race? May not such facts, on your showing, be regarded as a demand for a satisfaction which is to be found in sin? Can you appeal to the witness of the yearnings you have mentioned without seeing in lust and cruelty and covetousness indications that without these the nature of man in its rightful condition is not likely to be satisfied? Are you not in danger of undermining a distinction between right and wrong? Not so. The degradation of the savage, the vices of civilization, the sins of common life, indeed, need to be considered. But a proper study of them, and of their relation to the nature of man, does not show that they are real instincts, but that they are perversions of natural powers and desires. An instinct is but elementary. In man it needs to be educated, trained, guided. It is as capable of being perverted as of being rightly developed. All the acts which we call sins are caused by the wrong use of faculties. The common sense of mankind testifies that desires elementary in human nature in its proper state tend towards looking for a development which will demand what the Incarnation supplies. So true is the profound maxim of Christian theology that sin is always a perversion of what might be good, never a created substance in the nature in which is the image of God.⁴

¹ 1 St. John iii. 2.

² 1 Cor. xv. 35-54, xiii. 9-12. There is a striking description of the Resurrection in St. Bernard, *Sermo in die sancto Pasche*, 14: 'Nempe resurrectio, transitus et transmigratio. Christus enim, fratres, non recidit hodie, sed resurrexit: non rediit, sed transiit; transmigravit, non remeavit.'

³ 2 St. Pet. i. 4. Cf. St. Thom. Aq. *in loco*: 'Non consortio æqualitatis, quod est trium personarum solum: sed consortio participationis, quod est omnium fidelium per gratiam in presenti, et gloriam in futuro.'

⁴ See, e.g. St. Athan. *C. Gentes*, vi. vii.; St. Aug. *Enchirid.* xii. xiii. xxiii. xxiv.; St. John Dam. *Fid. Orthod.* ii. 4, 12; St. Thom. Aq. *Summa Theologica*, I. xlvi. 1, 3, xlix. 1-3; II. lxxv. 1. Cf. Dr. Mozley's account of St. Augustine's teaching: 'The faculties of mind and body which are used in a sinful action are indeed things, and are the creatures of God:

The Incarnation, again, is the sufficient answer to one of the most anxious questions of our time and of other times. The problems involved in the toleration of evil and pain, the prevalence of suffering among the innocent, the gains won by sin, the aggravation by seemingly unnecessary circumstances of distress which in itself might be accounted for, form a hindrance which holds back some from belief in God, and mars the readiness in service of many who do not disbelieve. Such difficulties may, of course, be lessened by various considerations. The ultimate justice of uniform law appeals to many minds. The fruitfulness of much which is hard to bear is well known. A belief in spiritual beings shows that many of the world's ills may be due to the direct and indirect working which is allowed to Satan by the Providence of God. But arguments of this kind, from whatever standpoint, are not in themselves really satisfying, and leave an inquirer still puzzled. His moral sense claims a further light if his wish to believe is to rise into an effective power in his life. The Incarnation is that light. It does not explain, but it bears witness. It bids men look from the unknown to the known. It exhibits the love of the Divine Son in a form which does not admit of doubt. It represents His human life as the manifestation of what He and the Father eternally are. It points to the seen acts of love, and asks for trust where there is not sight. The human parent trains the child by a long discipline of various kinds, and expects that the manifested love will produce trust in much which cannot be explained. Not otherwise does the eternal God treat the human race through the human life of the Divine Son.

In these various ways the Incarnation is seen to afford a means whereby the wants which human nature feels may be rightly supplied. It is not for this reason that we ourselves believe the doctrine. But the knowledge of this harmony between the revealed truth and an inference from the just consideration of the condition and nature of man affords a further verification to the believer of what he has already accepted as true, and may assert a claim that the central statement of distinctively Christian belief is entitled to the serious thought of all students of mankind.

We are not to be understood to assert that the Son of

but the sin itself is not a thing, and is consequently not a creature. God is indeed the Author of all that *is*, of every substance; but sin is not a substance, and *is* not. It is a declination from substance and from being, and not a part of it' (Mozley, *Treatise on the Augustinian Doctrine of Predestination*, p. 161).

God would have become Incarnate even if there had been no sin in man. Without sin, forgiveness would not have been needed. To the clear insight of a race which had never estranged itself from God, there might have been possible revelations of truth fuller than we now possess in methods altogether different. We cannot tell in what ways the instincts which seek for love and union might, under other circumstances, have been satisfied. Living in a world which sin has entered, our natural powers can only reason about human nature as it is. It is necessary to deprecate positive assertions on either side in the question what would have happened if man had not fallen. As regards our own opinion, while we are conscious of much which is plausible and attractive in the theory that the Incarnation, as part of God's eternal purpose, was independent of the Fall, there is, we think, a balance of probability in favour of the belief that if man had not sinned God would not have become Man.¹ Yet while we recognize the rare wisdom of the words in which Aquinas summed up his final judgment on this point:

'Things which happen simply from the Will of God, above all that is due to the creature, cannot be known to us except so far as they are delivered in Holy Scripture, through which the Divine Will is known to us. Wherefore, since in Holy Scripture the cause of the Incarnation is everywhere spoken of as proceeding from the sin of the first man, it is more fittingly said that the work of the Incarnation was ordained by God as a remedy against sin; so that, if there had been no sin, there would have been no Incarnation.'²

we do not overlook the sentence which he himself adds:

'Although the power of God is not hereby to be limited; for even if there had been no sin it would have been possible for God to become Incarnate.'³

and would further plead for caution in expressing as a definite belief what seems to us most likely to be true.⁴

¹ The Fathers speak of the Incarnation as resulting from the Fall: see, e.g. St. Athan. *De Incarn.* iv.; *Orat. c. Arian.* ii. 54; St. Aug. *Sermo* clxxiv. 2; St. Leo, *Sermo* lxxv. (al. lxxvii. *De Pentecoste*, iii.) 2. It might, however, be said that they are not definitely considering the subject.

² St. Thom. Aq. *Summa Theologica*, III. i. 3: 'Ea . . . quæ ex sola Dei voluntate proveniunt supra omne debitum creaturæ, nobis innotescere non possunt, nisi quatenus in Sacra Scriptura traduntur, per quam divina voluntas nobis innotescit. Unde cum in Sacra Scriptura ubique incarnationis ratio ex peccato primi hominis assignetur, convenientius dicitur incarnationis opus ordinatum esse a Deo in remedium contra peccatum; ita quod peccato non existente, incarnatio non fuisset.'

³ St. Thom. Aq. *Summa Theologica*, III. i. 3: 'Quamvis potentia Dei ad hoc non limitetur; potuisset enim etiam peccato non existente Deus incarnari.'

⁴ The reason for caution is that it does not seem so clear as Aquinas

II. The doctrine of the Incarnation, in its simplest form, declared that our Lord Jesus Christ is God and Man. When false theories were propounded, exact definitions were made. As the need arose, the Church was careful to safeguard the central truth by explicitly declaring what had all along been necessarily implied. The decisions of the great Councils were required if even the simplest form of the doctrine was not to be laid aside. But we may notice, further, that these clear and technical distinctions of the Church's Creed afford most practical help from the point of view we have been considering. Christ, says the Church, is truly God and perfectly Man, one Divine Person in two natures, Divine and human. Therefore it is in Him that forgiveness is won. If He is not God in the fullest sense, eternally equal with the Father, or if He is not completely Man, He cannot join together God and men, whom sin has divided. If He is not truly God, He is not the One to whom the debt is due, and who can therefore rightly remit it by the Sacrifice of Himself. If He is not perfectly Man He cannot, as the Victim, rightly represent the human race. If the two natures are commingled so as to cease to be distinctly Divine and human, there is no true link with either man or God; if there is not one Person to whom all the acts, both human and Divine, truly belong, the sufferings and death in the Manhood have not the infinite value of the works of a Person who is God.

When He is regarded as a teacher, or the bestower of grace, or the revealer of love and the object of dedication, the like is true. His perfect Humanity is the pledge that His utterances are considerate of human requirements, and is the channel whereby He bestows His highest gifts. The abiding character of His Manhood is the condition of the reality of Sacramental grace. His true Deity affords the proof that His life on earth rightly manifests the eternal life of God. The unity of His Person implies that His teaching is the teaching of God, and therefore infallible; His gifts are the gifts of God and instinct with Divine Power; union with Him is access to the Most High.

There are many to whom one of the most precious truths of the Incarnate life is the human sympathy of Christ. Its fulness depends on the perfection of His Manhood. Its ultimately thought, that Holy Scripture necessarily points in one direction on this matter. Thus, Bishop Westcott has written: 'At least it cannot be said that a belief in the absolute purpose of the Incarnation is at variance with Scripture' (*Epistles of St. John*, p. 314); see the whole of the elaborate essay on pp. 273-315, where a different opinion from our own is defended.

crown is formed by His sufferings in body and mind and soul. Unless His body was real, and His human mental and spiritual faculties complete, much would be lost. The Docetics and Apollinaris alike robbed themselves of the knowledge of the true sympathy of Christ.

Among His sufferings was temptation. It is the tempted Christ who sympathizes with tempted man. He willed to experience the pain which the malice of Satan and the pressure of human desire can inflict upon the soul. In the weariness of exhaustion¹ He was tempted through the cravings of bodily hunger² and the subtleties of spiritual trial.³ In the awful anticipations of Gethsemane⁴ and the misery of the Cross⁵ the struggle was renewed. The sinlessness of Christ is the sinlessness which conflict has left unstained. Through the complete faculties of perfect Manhood He has experienced what temptation means.

Yet He could not sin. Sin is the outcome, not of the natural faculties in their original condition, but of the perverted will. The human will of Christ could not choose to sin, because it was inflexibly determined upon holiness, habitually controlled by the Eternal Spirit, indissolubly united with His Divine Will in His single Personality. The Church's decree that He possesses perfectly all the parts of human nature testifies to the possibility and reality of His temptation; the decision that in Him is one Person only, and that Person Divine, affirms the impossibility of His fall. Sin is the act of the will; the will is directed by the person; if the Person of our Lord could have fallen, sin would have been a possibility for God.

Here we must correct a common mistake. The impeccability of Christ does not lessen the fulness of His sympathy with those who are tempted. It is a known law of the spiritual life that those sympathize most deeply with the tempted who are themselves most free from sin. The reason is not only that they are most filled with the love of God; it is also because they have known more completely what temptation means. It is only he who has not yielded who knows all that Satan and human desire can do. He who surrenders before the battle is ended has never experienced its hardest stress. To give way is to end the struggle.

¹ St. Matt. iv. 2; St. Luke iv. 2.

² St. Matt. iv. 3; St. Luke iv. 3.

³ St. Matt. iv. 3, 6, 9; St. Luke iv. 3, 6, 7, 9-11.

⁴ St. Matt. xxvi. 36-44; St. Mark xiv. 32-39; St. Luke xxii. 41-44.

⁵ St. Matt. xxvii. 39-44; St. Mark xv. 29-32; St. Luke xxiii. 35-39.

There is another reason. The more holy the soul, the more painful is temptation. To the saints it has been the scorching horror which has sometimes darkened life. As the will which does not yield lengthens out the struggle and endures the hardest part, so the more fully the will is set on God the more painful is any impulse which leads away from Him. Because of His sinlessness, temptation was more terrible to Christ than to others.

But, it may be said, you misunderstand the point in what you call a mistake. The real stress of temptation lies in the struggle. If there is no possibility of sin, how can the struggle exist? Much of the pain of temptation proceeds from the fear that it may prevail. If there was no struggle and no fear of defeat in Christ when tempted, He cannot have passed through temptation in such a way as to possess the human sympathy which is the result of experience. Did not the exact theological definition of the Council of Ephesus destroy, so far as sympathy in temptation is concerned, the practical value of the decree of Constantinople?

We repeat, the human sympathy of Christ is not lessened by His impeccability. It is the struggle to be true to God, and the hatred of suggestions to evil, which make the sorest element in temptation. The fear of defeat is at a lower point. To saints whose faith in God was undimmed, and who knew their own wills were true, temptation has often been more grievous than to the less holy. In Christ the conflict was real. The desires of the natural faculties to eat when hungry,¹ to avoid suffering,² to win the people by ways not ordained by the Father,³ to obtain earthly power as a means of righteous influence when this was not the course which the Father had appointed,⁴ could be repressed only by the action of His will. It is the tension of the will which makes the severity of the struggle in men. It is its unceasing direction in a hard path which causes the mental and spiritual and often bodily strain which has been the burden of many lives. That unswerving determination, with all that it costs, was in the human will of Christ.

We said that, besides the struggle, the hatred of the thought of wrong is part of the pain of temptation. As men grow in holiness, this sensitiveness grows. At each grade of moral

¹ St. Matt. iv. 3; St. Luke iv. 3.

² St. Matt. iv. 3, xxvi. 36-44, xxvii. 39-44; St. Mark xiv. 32-39, xv. 29-32; St. Luke iv. 3, xxii. 41-44, xxiii. 35-39.

³ St. Matt. iv. 6, xxvii. 39-44; St. Mark xv. 29-32; St. Luke iv. 9-11, xxiii. 35-39.

⁴ St. Matt. iv. 8, 9; St. Luke iv. 5-7.

life, a suggestion which, a stage lower, would hardly jar, becomes a source of suffering. To the saint, the impulse to an action which at another time would be right causes, when it is not God's will, a grief greater than the temptation to dark sins brings to some. We may believe that in the sinless Christ the temptation to depart, in whatever degree, from the all-holy will of the eternal Father brought pain such as tempted men rarely know.

Christ could not sin, and His impeccability, rightly understood, increases His human power of sympathy with the tempted, and even with the fallen who wish to rise, as, on a lower level, it is the servant of Christ who is nearest to His Master's sinlessness who is most sympathetic in temptation and most tender to raise and heal.

The Christ of the Catholic Church is the Christ of the Gospels. The dogmatic decisions of the fourth¹ and fifth² and seventh³ centuries are the necessary safeguards of the simple truth of the first century. And the Christ of the Catholic Church is also the Christ Who answers to human needs and satisfies the longings of human hearts. That is not our own reason, as we said of the Incarnation itself, for believing the decrees of the Church. But it is the ratifying act of the mind which theologians have looked for,⁴ and it is a reason why all who study facts should fairly face what is really meant by the doctrine of the Incarnate God.

And it is sometimes well to recall that the Incarnation is the pledge of the ultimate satisfaction of all the true yearnings of man, and of the ultimate solution of all his strange puzzles. It points on to the perfect revelation of the God Whom now we see 'in a riddle,'⁵ while it shows His wisdom and love in the earthly life of the Divine Son.

III. It is as a prelude to the consideration of the Bampton Lectures for 1891 that we have dwelt at length on an aspect of the Incarnation which is, as we think, of importance.

¹ Against the Arians in 325 A.D., and the Apollinarians in 381 A.D.

² Against the Nestorians in 431 A.D., and the Eutychians in 451 A.D.

³ Against the Monothelites in 680 A.D.

⁴ See, e.g. St. Aug. *De lib. Arbit.* I. ii. 4: 'Aderit enim Deus, et nos intelligere quod credidimus faciet'; *De Symb. ad Catech.* iv. 'Prius credite, postea intelligite'; *De diver. Quæst. octogintatribus*, xlviii: 'Ea quæ de divinis rebus non possunt intelligi, nisi ab his qui mundo sunt corde; quod fit præceptis servatis, quæ de bene vivendo accipiuntur'; St. Anselm, *Cur Deus Homo*, i. 2 (Boso): 'Sicut rectus ordo exigit: ut profunda Christianæ fidei credamus priusquam ea præsumamus ratione discutere: ita negligentia mihi videtur, si postquam confirmati sumus in fide, non studemus quod credimus intelligere.'

⁵ 1 Cor. xiii. 12, *en aivt̃yari*.

Before
what
be fo
conter

M
guish
in th
possib
perso
as th
which
and c
be m
the p
exclu
some
phila
maki
inqui
terist
other
select
by ou
unles

'to
messa
is to
vario
whole

F
need
secon
super
ence
some
struc
and
in th
powe
(pp.
char
with
upon
'exp
from

Before we proceed to comment upon the many merits and what seem to us occasional defects in these lectures, it may be for the convenience of our readers if we describe their contents.

Mr. Gore begins his first lecture by defining the 'distinguishing characteristic' of Christianity as faith in Jesus Christ in the sense of 'such unreserved self-committal as is only possible' because He is God. Thus, 'true Christianity is' 'a personal relationship' (p. 1), and loses its power in proportion as this is lost sight of, whether by a false ecclesiasticism which substitutes formal acceptance of the Church's creed and commands for the 'living devotion' to which these should be means, by exaggerations of the work of the Saints and the position of the blessed Mother of our Lord, the almost exclusive regard for personal feeling in the subjectivity of some forms of religion, the negation of doctrine in mere philanthropy or academic states of mind which tend towards making the study of Christianity scarcely more than an inquiry into a philosophic school of thought. This characteristic, which marks the contrast between Christianity and other religions, of which Mohammedanism and Buddhism are selected as examples, is accounted for by the claims made by our Lord in the Gospel history, which cannot be justified unless He is regarded as being truly God, since

'to represent our Lord only as a good man conscious of a message from God, like one of the Prophets or John the Baptist, is to do violence not to one Gospel only, or to single passages in various Gospels, but to the general tenor of the Gospels as a whole' (p. 17).

From a statement at the end of the first lecture of the need of the dogmas of theology, Mr. Gore passes in the second lecture to consider the position of our Lord as 'a supernatural person.' Nature itself is a witness to the existence of God, and indicates in its progressive development some truths about Him. The 'mechanical laws of inorganic structures,' 'the growth and flexibility of vital forms of plant and animal,' 'the reason, conscience, love, personality of man,' in their several ways express the 'immutability, immensity, power, wisdom,' the life, the 'mind and character' of God (pp. 32, 33). Yet nature is an imperfect witness to the moral characteristics of God. The Incarnation, not out of harmony with the teachings of nature, but 'transcending, or advancing upon' them (p. 33), reveals the 'goodness and love' which 'express God more adequately' than anything we learn apart from Christ. He 'is the crown of nature,' and 'profoundly

natural,' because the Incarnation completes the natural disclosures which without it form 'nothing else than an imperfect fragment' (p. 34). He is 'supernatural' as well as natural—

'because in Him the Divine Being who had been always at work, in physical nature as "the persistent energy of all things," and in human nature as the rational light of man, here assumes humanity, spirit and body, as the instrument through which to exhibit with a new completeness, and in a new intensity, His own personality and character.'

At the same time—

'The term "supernatural" is purely relative to what at any particular stage of thought we mean by nature. Nature is a progressive development of life, and each new stage of life appears supernatural from the point of view of what lies below it' (p. 35).

Thus Christ consummates nature, but His work is also to restore, since nature, as we know it, is distorted by sin. And the rightful recognition of what nature and sin are supplies the probability of acceptance of the claim of Christ:

'Read . . . the book of nature, which is God's book; read especially its later chapters, when moral beings appear upon the scene; you will find it a plot without a *dénouement*, a complication without a solution, a first volume which demands a second. Study the Christ. He appears as the second volume of the Divine Word, in which the threads are being disentangled. The justifying principle emerges, the lines of incident are seen working towards a solution, the whole becomes intelligible and full of hope. But the eye is still carried forward, there is a third volume yet expected. It is to contain "the revelation of the glory," the "far-off divine event to which the whole creation moves"' (pp. 52, 53).

The third lecture is on the historical testimony about our Lord. The consideration of the question is to be approached—

'on the one hand with the disposition of faith, that is in the intellect a perception of the need and reasonableness of redemption, in the heart the desire for the word of God, and the will to surrender ourselves to Him; on the other hand, with a simple and open-minded determination to submit ourselves to the results of real inquiry at its last issue' (p. 58).

From this standpoint the lecturer discusses the central parts of the evidence. It is shown how the undoubted Epistles of St. Paul, the earliest evangelical narrative as represented in St. Mark's Gospel, and the teaching of St. John, concur in testifying to a supernatural Christ Who is the Incarnate Son

of Go
a bo
writte
world
by th
receiv
tale, a
'train
Gospo
testim
delusi
of mi
men's
nents
event
virgin
the c
Luke
St. J
the '
(p. 78)

'when
accept
we fin
this el
beginn

W
we ca
which
power
must
"No
belief
(p. 79)

T
dogm
teach
Chris
great
Apos
attach
valu
They
its p
few i

of God. This historical evidence is of value. 'If ever such a book as the "History of Testimony" is worthily and fairly written, the Apostles will take very high rank among the world's witnesses' (p. 74). They were fitted for their work by their character and training, as 'plain men who could receive the impress of facts; who could tell a simple, plain tale, and show by their lives how much they believed it,' as 'trained to be witnesses' by our Lord, Who 'intended His Gospel to rest upon facts' (pp. 74, 75). They bore their testimony in a sceptical atmosphere, not likely to produce delusion. The testimony was of an original type, speaking of miracles not easily to be accounted for as the creation of men's minds. The witnesses exhibit the fairness to opponents which is a mark of trustworthiness. There is one event which does not rest primarily on their words, 'the virgin-birth of Jesus' (p. 77). There is evidence for it in the concurrence of the narratives of St. Matthew and St. Luke evidently embodying the information received from St. Joseph and the Blessed Virgin, and in the 'firm place' the 'event holds' 'in the earliest traditions of East and West' (p. 78). And

'when we approach it on the basis of the apostolic testimony already accepted, with confidence in the evangelical narrative already secured, we find good reason for believing, and no good reason for doubting, this element of the Christian creed constantly emphasized from the beginning.

We Christians, then, may say our Creed in the confidence that we can face the facts. The primary *motive* to belief is the appeal which Jesus makes to our heart, and conscience, and mind. The *power* to believe, or to maintain belief, is the gift of God, which we must earnestly solicit in prayer; it is the movement of the Spirit. "No man can say Jesus is Lord, but in the Holy Ghost." But belief—Christian belief—is justified and supported by the evidence' (p. 79).

The fourth and fifth lectures are on the relation of the dogmatic decisions of the Church on the Incarnation to the teaching of Holy Scripture, and on the revelation of God in Christ. It is clearly shown how the definitions of the four great Councils protect, without adding to, the faith of the Apostles; were gradually worked out under the pressure of attack and through outward confusion; are of permanent value because the truths they express are of vital moment. They are to be regarded as leading to the Bible, not taking its place, as the outcome of necessity, and therefore rightly few in number, as not appealing to a shallow logic such as

that of the heretical teachers, but issuing 'in a deeper, more rational position' (p. 110). Christ is the manifestation of the Father because He is Himself very God. It is the practical importance of the Nicene decision that it maintains the fact that union with Christ is union with God and 'the Christian revelation' 'the unveiling of God' (p. 114). That man was made in the image of God implies that in him is the 'counterpart and real expression' of 'the divine' 'qualities,' and affords the possibility 'that God can really exist under conditions of manhood without ceasing to be, and to reveal, God; and man can be taken to be the organ of Godhead without one whit ceasing to be human' (pp. 116, 117). Christ reveals the personality and love and justice and truth of God; He exhibits in His teaching about faith and prayer the method by which God works in the spiritual world as a law akin to those of the natural world; He discloses the doctrine of the Holy Trinity which, though it is 'agreeable to reason,' is 'not discoverable by reason' (p. 134). He opens the way for the true worship of God and the rightful confidence of man.

The subject of the sixth lecture is Jesus Christ as 'the revelation of manhood,' as exhibiting 'man to God and to himself' (p. 142). It is pointed out that on three separate occasions—the condemnation of Apollinaris, of Eutyches, of the Monothelites—the Church took pains to protect the doctrine of the Manhood of Christ. It is regarded as a sign of the working of the Providence of God in the decisions of the Church that these decrees 'were framed with such emphasis on the human nature of Jesus in an age when the tendency of Catholic thought was certainly not humanitarian' (p. 143). Yet the truth of Christ's Manhood, always part of the doctrine of the Church, has, Mr. Gore thinks, been at various times obscured in practical treatment. This he ascribes partly to the failure of many to realize properly 'Christianity as a way of life for man—"the way"—and Christ as "the living law of righteousness,"' partly to the metaphysical treatment of the Incarnation common in mediæval theology, partly to the fact that in the sixteenth century 'discussions about justification, predestination, and the atonement were allowed a disproportionate share of attention' (pp. 143, 144). After this introduction, he proceeds to consider the teaching of the Gospels on the human knowledge of our Lord. In His thirteenth year, 'in the temple courts He impressed the doctors as a child of marvellous insight and intelligence,' and 'even then' possessed 'the consciousness of His unique Sonship.' Yet 'He grew so truly as a human child that

Josep
cond
grow
bodi
clear
(p. 1
insig
reall

led a
was a
their
emph
minis
If H
His
in re
woul
sugg
dent
out o
huma

His
'sup
that
Divin
limit

This
show
aske
the c
in th
the c

John
Son
Fath
the v
Spiri
His
Fath
Fath
tion,
Fath
lation
made

Joseph and His mother had not been led to expect from Him conduct incompatible with childhood; and 'there was a real growth in mental apprehension and spiritual capacity, as in bodily stature' (p. 145). From His Baptism onwards it is clear that 'He knew His eternal pre-existence and Sonship' (p. 146); 'He frequently exhibits a supernatural knowledge, insight, and foresight' (p. 147). Yet there is in Him 'the really human development of life'—

'He receives as man the unction of the Holy Ghost; He was led as man "of the Spirit into the wilderness," and hungered, and was subjected as man to real temptations of Satan, such as made their appeal to properly human faculties, and were met by the free employment of human will. . . . When He goes out to exercise His ministry, He bases His authority on the unction of the Spirit If His miraculous power appears as the appropriate endowment of His person, it was still a gift of God to Him as man. . . . St. John, in recording the words of Jesus on the raising of Lazarus, would teach us to see in some at least of His miracles, what is suggested also elsewhere by our Lord's gestures, a power dependent on the exercise of prayer. . . . He does not appear to teach out of an absolute divine omniscience, but rather as conditioned by human nature.'

His

'supernatural illumination is, if of higher quality, yet analogous to that vouchsafed to prophets and apostles. It is not necessarily Divine consciousness. And it coincides in our Lord with apparent limitations of knowledge' (pp. 146, 147).

This limitation of knowledge in our Lord is stated to be shown in the surprise He expressed and the questions He asked on many occasions, in His exercise of prayer, 'which is the characteristic utterance of human faith and trust' (p. 148), in the fourth Word from the Cross, and in His ignorance of the day and the hour of His second coming.

'A similar impression is left on our mind by the Gospel of St. John. Unmistakably is our Lord there put before us as the eternal Son of the Father incarnate, but it also appears that the Son of the Father is living and teaching under human conditions. He speaks the words of God, St. John tells us, because God "giveth not the Spirit by measure"—that is, because of the complete endowment of His manhood. He Himself says, that He accomplishes "what the Father taught Him:" that He can do only "what He sees the Father doing:" that the Father makes to Him a progressive revelation, "He shall show Him greater works than these:" that the Father "gave Him" the divine "Name," that is, the positive revelation of Himself, to communicate to the Apostles: that he has made known to them "all things that He had heard of the Father,"

or "the words which the Father had given Him." The idea is thus irresistibly suggested of a message of definite content made over to our Lord to impart. Now, even though we bear in mind to the fullest extent the eternal subordination and receptivity of the Son, it still remains plain that words such as have been quoted express Him as receiving and speaking under the limitations of a properly human state. . . . Our Lord exhibits insight and foresight of prophetic quality. . . . He never enlarges our stock of natural knowledge, physical or historical, out of the divine omniscience. . . . Up to the time of His death He lived and taught, He thought and was inspired and was tempted, as true and proper man, under the limitations of consciousness which alone make possible a really human experience' (pp. 149, 150).

For these reasons Mr. Gore rejects as a merely '*à priori* picture,' not a representation of 'the historical Christ,' the conception of the human knowledge of our Lord which is found in 'the scholastic and later dogmatic theologians' (pp. 151-153). He rejects also as equally abstract and unhistorical the theory of 'others, belonging to very modern ways of thought,' 'that Christ' was 'peccable or liable to sin, and fallible or liable to make mistakes'—

'Place yourself face to face with the Christ of the Gospels; let His words, His claim, His tone, make upon you their natural impression; and you will not, I believe, find that He will allow you to think of Him as either liable to sin or liable to mislead. He never fears sin, or hints that He might be found inadequate to the tremendous charge He bore; He does not let us think of Him as growing better or as needing improvement, though He passes through each imperfect stage of manhood to completeness. He challenges criticism, He speaks as the invincible emancipator of man. . . . He appears in no relation to sin, but as the discernor, the conqueror, the judge of it, in all its forms and to the end of time. In the same way, whenever and whomsoever He teaches, it is in the tone which could only be morally justifiable in the case of one who taught without risk of mistake; claiming by His own inherent right the submission of the conscience and will and intellect of men. . . . When men suggest fallibility in our Lord's teaching, or peccability in His character, it is as much in the teeth of the Gospel record as when, on the other hand, they deny Him limitation of knowledge, or the reality of a human, moral trial, in the days of His flesh' (pp. 153, 154).

The life of Christ is therefore regarded as a 'double life of infallible authority and of human limitation' (p. xvi.), and as, in this respect, to some extent 'analogous' to the life 'of a prophet like Jeremiah' (p. 155). The unity of the two elements will, it is said, be understood as we keep in view the motive of the Incarnation as a means for the recovery and

perfe
voice
prog
natio
(p. 1
act, '160).
know
teach
theol
early
the A
over,
infer
were
theol
I
Chris
neces
as '1
was
hood
man
narro
T
is of
ducin
unqu
conf
opera
'beca
revel
unlik
'7
of the
This
How
fall w
disclo
forma
future
His c
conte
tions.
so as
work
VO

perfecting of man, requiring a pure life and an infallible voice, yet requiring also 'a true example of manhood—tried, progressive, perfected' (p. 157), and the method of the Incarnation as the 'self-beggary' which 'St. Paul describes' (p. 158), while this 'self-limitation,' as our Lord's voluntary act, 'involves no dishonouring of the eternal Son' (pp. 159, 160). It is added that if the view of our Lord's human knowledge which is thus advocated is contrary to the express teaching of 'many of the Fathers' 'and almost all mediæval theologians,' it receives 'a great deal of sanction from the best early theologians,' 'and from some of the best theologians of the Anglican Church since the Reformation' (p. 163). Moreover, the mediæval writers were necessarily affected by their inferior critical knowledge and lower standard of truth, and were influenced to no small extent by very questionable theology.

In the concluding part of this lecture, points in which Christ in His humanity is unlike other men are noticed, His necessary sinlessness and entire moral freedom, His perfection as 'man completely in the image of God, realizing all that was in the Divine idea for man' (p. 168), His 'catholic manhood' 'exempt, not from the limitations which belong to manhood, but from the limitations which make our manhood narrow and isolated, merely local or national' (pp. 168, 169).

The seventh lecture is on authority in religion. 'Authority is of different types.' It may be 'despotic,' aiming at producing 'in the intellect simple acceptance,' 'in the conduct unquestioning obedience;' or 'fatherly,' seeking 'to produce conformity of character, sympathy of mind, intelligent co-operation in action.' 'Christianity is authoritative,' partly 'because it is an educational system, partly because it is a revelation of the most high God' (p. 177), but its authority, unlike that of the Old Testament, is fatherly, not despotic.

'The characteristic note of the New Testament authority is that of the father over the son, and for this very reason it is moderate. This moderation is noticeable both in its range and in its method. . . . However our Lord's silence is to be interpreted, at any rate it did not fall within the scope of His mission to reveal His omniscience by disclosures in the region of natural knowledge, or His eternity by information about history, otherwise inaccessible, in the past or in the future. . . . Moreover, within the spiritual region how reserved are His communications. . . . The reserve which is noticeable in the content is noticeable also in the method of our Lord's communications. . . . Our Lord . . . taught, and especially taught His disciples, so as to train their characters and stimulate their intelligences; He worked to make them intelligent sons and friends, not obedient

VOL. XXXIII.—NO. LXVI.

U

'slaves. He would have them set ends above means, and principles above ordinances. . . . And His own ordinances, such as baptism and the eucharist, are Christian sacraments and not Jewish laws. . . . They are obligatory, but as food is obligatory ; for to know their secret is to desire their use, as a son desires food and fellowship in his father's household' (pp. 178-181).

Thus Christian authority encourages inquiry, satisfies reason, and desires to commend itself to the minds of all men. Its true method is well represented in the ideal of the Church of England and has been forsaken by the Church of Rome. 'The Christian authority is simply Jesus Christ.' His Apostles are 'witnesses qualified for a unique function by a special inspiration' (p. 188), the Church is 'the primary depository of the Christian tradition,' the New Testament is 'the criterion of teaching' (p. 190). Our Lord recognises the Old Testament as authoritative, but His use of it does not bind us 'to the acceptance of the Jewish tradition in regard to the authorship and literary character of different portions of the Old Testament,' as, 'for example,' 'to the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch as a whole' or the historical character of the flood or the 'entombment' of Jonah (p. 195). Moreover, our Lord's reference to Psalm cx. does not necessitate the belief that this Psalm is by David, because His object is not 'to prove or disprove anything, to affirm or to deny anything, but simply to press upon the Pharisees an argument which their habitual assumptions ought to have suggested to them, to confront them with just that question which they, with their principles, ought to have been asking themselves' (p. 198).

The subject of the last lecture is the high standard of life set before us by Christ, which, though His rules must be interpreted in their principles, may not be explained away or watered down, and which is practicable because our Lord Himself, who gave the example, dwells in Christians with the power which enables them to imitate it.

IV. It is a welcome task to call attention to some features of the Bampton Lectures which demand the gratitude of earnest Christians.

There must be few who could read the book thoughtfully without realizing the strength of the writer's grasp on central truth. His subject is to him a matter of vital moment. His conclusions are plainly parts of his own life, thought out, cross-examined, grasped as verities which cannot be denied. There is a sense of rest in reading the calm and measured words which tell of a meaning which is deep and real and valued.

Th
not on
writer
author
eviden
ances
ing cir
to disc
lapse o
out of
Th
tends i
of one
has co
and ph
where
him, M
real st
really
differen

Th
value a
which,
admira
dogma
ments
exists
of sin a
stood
Apostl
regard
opinion
in the

Th
Faith.
clearne
better
of God
depend
assume

'Ch
His litt
they mu
ness. I
for a ti

This grasp on truth has its attractive and reassuring power not only because it is firm. We have been struck by the writer's historical sense. The lectures show the marks of an author who has accustomed himself to notice facts, to weigh evidence, to balance probabilities. He knows what allowances are rightly made for conditions of mind and surrounding circumstances. He would be likely to be one of the first to discern what had happened if human speculation and the lapse of time had developed the figure of the Divine Christ out of the life of a mere man.

The evident appreciation of much in modern thought tends in the same direction. We feel we are reading the work of one who knows what the men of the day are saying and has considered it. The regard for the science and criticism and philosophy of our own time shows itself in many places where it is not verbally expressed. Unless we misunderstand him, Mr. Gore has asked himself in patient study what is the real standpoint of those who differ from him, what doubts really mean, what is the strength as well as the weakness of different methods of denying the Faith of Christ.

These, among other, features give the lectures their great value as an apologetic work. We have noticed four passages which, from this point of view, have seemed to us specially admirable. The considerations which suggest the need of dogma in theology (pp. 21-26), the summary of the arguments from nature which tend towards showing that God exists (pp. 31, 32), the statement of the necessity of the sense of sin and the desire for holiness if Christianity is to be understood (pp. 36-39), the description of the qualities in the Apostles and in their testimony which make it reasonable to regard them as trustworthy witnesses (pp. 74-77), are, in our opinion, of the very highest worth both in their substance and in the method in which they are stated.

The lectures are a great deal more than a defence of the Faith. They contain expositions of Christian truth of great clearness and power. We have never, we think, met with a better statement of the revelation in Christ of the Personality of God and of one side of the doctrine that there was no independent personality in the human nature which our Lord assumed than in the passage where it is said :

'Christ attends to, respects, develops, educates personality in His little band of apostles ; and that because to become like Him, they must realize personality in its depth, its fulness, its distinctiveness. In Him it was no accident, nothing which He had assumed for a time or of which He could rid Himself ; it belonged to His

eternal nature ; over against the Father in the eternal world, He stood person with person, a son with His Father. It was because He was eternally personal that He had been able to give personality to a human nature. Yes, as we gaze at the personal Christ, incarnate God, we are sure that whatever else God is, above and beyond what we understand by personality—and we can depend upon it that He is infinitely above and beyond what we can comprehend—yet He is at least personal ; for He has manifested His personality to us, and made it intelligible, in a human nature, while on the other hand the human nature loses not one whit of its humanity because the personality which is acting in it is the personality of very God' (pp. 118, 119).

And the statements of the existence of law in the workings of God (pp. 124-130), of the revelation of the Triune Being of God by our Lord (pp. 130-137), of the sinlessness and true moral freedom of Christ (pp. 165-167), are not less valuable. Other instances could be given of the lecturer's power of making difficult theological doctrines clear.

In these lectures, again, practical religion is never forgotten in the discussion of theological dogmas. The conviction that doctrinal truth reaches its proper issue only in religious life is incidentally shown in passage after passage, and is sometimes given emphatic expression. The teaching how the evils of society can only be adequately treated by the remedies of Jesus Christ (pp. 38, 39), the contrast which results from the setting up of our Lord's life as a standard for ourselves (pp. 205, 206), the assertion of the need of Christians being true to their own moral law (pp. 210-215), are impressive. From the last passage we extract the following sentences :

'What I am complaining of, what I want you to complain of, with a persistence and a conviction which shall make our complaint fruitful of reform, is—not that commercial and social selfishness exists in the world, or even that it appears to dominate in society ; but that its profound antagonism to the spirit of Christ is not recognized, that there is not amongst us anything that can be called an adequate conception of what Christian morality means. . . . We want the Christian moral law, the law of purity, of brotherhood, of sacrifice, to be as intelligibly presented and as clearly understood as the dogmas of the Christian creed. We want it worked out with adequate knowledge in its bearing on the various departments of human life. In a word, we want a fresh and luminous presentation of the Christian moral code and some adequate guarantee that one who is deliberately, persistently, and in overt act, repudiating its plainest obligations shall cease to belong to the Christian body. "Do not ye," writes St. Paul to the Corinthian Church, "judge them that are within, whereas

them th
among

It is ac

'It i
she sho
cluding
moral.
acquies

V.

must r
points
what M

I. V

of the
more th
to prov
petually
to verif
tion, wi
a sound
in Holy
the tes
Church
think th
the Chu
living v
Apostle
'Where
where t
and the
who ha
truth,'⁵
decrees
garded
that th

¹ See
Incarn. 1
But the
Holy Scr
² See
Harret. x
³ St.
⁴ Iren
⁵ St.
⁶ See,

them that are without God judgeth? Put away the wicked man from among yourselves" (pp. 212, 213).

It is added in a note :

'It is inseparable from the idea of a Church's healthy action that she should be exercising "the power of the keys," the power of including and excluding, by formal and free discipline, doctrinal and moral. . . . Its liability to misuse is no excuse for a Churchman acquiescing in its practical disuse' (p. 271).

V. In our great appreciation of this valuable book we must not forget our duty as critics, and there are several points on which we feel obliged to express our dissent from what Mr. Gore says.

I. We do not think there is a fully adequate representation of the authority of the Church. A distinction is emphasized more than once between 'the Church to teach' and 'the Bible to prove' (pp. 81, 188), and it is said 'The Church is perpetually to teach; the New Testament is perpetually to prove, to verify, to correct the teaching' (p. 191). Now this distinction, with a certain amount of explanation, appears to us to be a sound one. The Fathers do say that the Faith is contained in Holy Scripture, and that the Bible, rightly interpreted, is the test of truth.¹ Moreover, their main thought of the Church as a teacher is the thought of a witness.² But we do not think this is all. It is a Scriptural and patristic doctrine that the Church is the organ of the Holy Ghost, and therefore a living voice declaring the truth. Our Lord's promises to His Apostles cannot otherwise be explained.³ When Irenæus says, 'Where the Church is there is also the Spirit of God, and where the Spirit of God is there is the Church and all grace, and the Spirit is truth,'⁴ or when Cyprian declares that those who have left the Church 'have left the head and source of truth,'⁵ or when Augustine appeals to the Church's deliberate decrees as binding decisions,⁶ such utterances are to be regarded as rightly representative, and as implying the belief that the Divine Spirit guides the settled judgment of the

¹ See, e.g. Irenæus, *C. Hær.* II. xli. 1; St. Athan. *C. Gentes*, i.; *De Incarn.* lvi.; St. Cyril Jer. *Cat.* iv. 17; St. Vinc. Ler. *Commonit.* xxix. But the above statement is even better supported by the use made of Holy Scripture by the Fathers than by what they actually say.

² See, e.g. Irenæus, *C. Hær.* I. iii., III. iv. 1, v. 1; Tertull. *De Præscr. Hæret.* xxxvi.; St. Aug. *De Bapt. c. Don.* iv. 31.

³ St. Matt. xvi. 18, xxviii. 20; St. John xiv. 16, 17, 26, xvi. 13.

⁴ Irenæus, *C. Hær.* III. xxxviii. 1.

⁵ St. Cyprian, *De Unit. Eccles.* xii.

⁶ See, e.g. St. Aug. *De Bapt. c. Don.* i. 27, ii. 4, 5, 14, iv. 8, 9.

Church into certain truth. Nor is such a belief inconsistent with the claims made for Holy Scripture, or with the view of the Church as a witness to the Faith which has once been revealed. When it is realized that in these different methods of declaring truth there can from the nature of the case be no contradiction, it is seen how there is infallible teaching both in the Bible and in the accepted beliefs of the whole Church. As was admirably stated by Dr. Pusey :

'The authority of the Church was given to her by her Divine Lord within certain limits. "Teach them," He said, "whatever I command you." All must admit, then, that she could not command anything which should be really contrary to Holy Scripture. Nor must she contradict herself. The Fathers of the later General Councils began their office by expressing their assent to the earlier, and considered their own work as only expanding what was contained in the earlier, with a view to meet the new heresy which had emerged. So neither is it any undue limitation of the authority of the Church to lay down another limit, that the Church may not require "as necessary to salvation" what is not read in Holy Scripture, or may be proved by it. This only implies the historical fact that the same body of saving truths which the Apostles first preached orally they afterwards, under the inspiration of God the Holy Ghost, wrote in Holy Scripture, God ordering in His Providence that, in the unsystematic teaching of Holy Scripture, all should be embodied which is essential to establish the faith. This is said over and over again by the Fathers. This limitation of the power of the Church does not set individuals free to criticize, on their private judgments, what the whole Church has decided. It is an axiom, "God cannot contradict Himself;" yet this does not set Rationalists free to deny any truth in Holy Scripture, because, in their private misjudgments, they think it at variance with some other favourite truth. . . . As the truth, "God cannot contradict Himself," does not set men free to criticize any portion of His revelation, so neither does the truth, "His Church may not lay down as necessary to salvation what God has not revealed in His Word," set men free to criticize what He has taught His whole Church to declare and receive as saving truth, any more than that other maxim (which also limits the power of the Church, but which all receive), "His Church may not contradict His Word."¹

We question whether Mr. Gore would regard it as possible that the Church as a body should err about the Faith ; but we are afraid his way of presenting the Church's authority tends to make too little of the value of her decrees in themselves.

In connection with the same subject, we must express our doubts whether the lecturer allows sufficiently for the positive usefulness of dogmatic decisions. It is, of course, true that the

¹ Pusey, *An Eirenicon* [part i.], pp. 40-42.

dogm
to sa
teach
some
we fe
tions
accep
right
teach
matic
religi
2.
stron
grace
indir
thank
which
'whic
(p. vi
from
natur
works
redeem
even
the V
the u
and i
more
The
lectur
custo
unifor
to th
contra
while
regret

¹ T
primar
here, i
² C
express
assists
the Ch
relieve
³ S
⁴ S

dogmatic decrees of the Councils were historically 'intended to say "no" rather than to say "yes," to deny rather than to teach' (p. 106); that is to say, they are due to the need of some particular errors being repudiated by the Church. But we feel that the treatment of this matter minimises considerations which seem to us of great importance. Since the fully accepted decrees of the Church are certain truth, they may rightly be used as sources of theological thought infallibly teaching all which they necessarily imply;¹ and clear dogmatic decisions have in themselves a very definite practical religious value.²

2. One of the most striking features of the lectures is the strong sense of the 'unity of God's work in nature and in grace' (p. 41). There is much which bears directly or indirectly on this subject which we have read with great thankfulness, and we look forward with interest to the book which the preface promises, dealing with this and other matters, 'which shall appeal to a more strictly theological public' (p. vii.). Yet we are not satisfied that the lectures are free from a tendency to confuse the real distinction between the natural and the supernatural. It is the same God Who works in nature and in grace, Who creates and sustains and redeems and sanctifies. One of the most remarkable passages even in the works of Athanasius is that in which he describes the Word, when Incarnate, as still quickening and controlling the universe.³ But may we not rightly say that in Revelation and in grace laws which are merely natural are superseded by a more immediate and more personal working of God Himself? The truth of this statement seems to be allowed by the lecturer, for he says 'in a miracle . . . God violates the customary method of His action,' 'violates a superficial uniformity in the interests of deeper law' (p. 45), and refers to the passage in which Augustine speaks of miracles as contrary to the 'well-known and customary order' of nature, while in accordance with its supreme law.⁴ This makes us regret the more a passage on page 35, part of which we have

¹ There is a valuable statement on 'inferential theology,' which applies primarily to inferences from Holy Scripture, but which may also be applied here, in Liddon, *Bampton Lectures*, pp. 440-42.

² Cf. Newman, *Arians of the Fourth Century*, p. 146: 'The intellectual expression of theological truth not only excludes heresy, but directly assists the acts of religious worship and obedience, fixing and stimulating the Christian spirit in the same way as the knowledge of the One God relieves and illuminates the perplexed conscience of the religious heathen.'

³ St. Athan. *De Incarn.* xvii.

⁴ St. Aug. *C. Faustum.* xxvi. 3.

already quoted, where we think the confusion we have referred to is made. The distinction between the supernatural working of God in Revelation and grace and His working in ordinary laws appears to be that in the former there is a personal Divine intervention which does not take place in any process rightly called natural. If this is so, it is not true that 'the term "supernatural" is purely relative to what at any particular stage of thought we mean by nature' (p. 35). The matter is important from our point of view, since, in our opinion, the distinction we have made underlies the truth of the infallible character of the teaching of God in the Bible and the Church, and the maintenance of it is therefore necessary to the permanent belief in the authority of Christ's religion. It is because there is a real distinction between the different methods of the same God that a line can be drawn between the uncertainty of the highest natural thoughts of good men and the certainty of the inspired truths of the Christian Faith.

We may here express our regret at the use of a phrase which, with slight variations, occurs more than once. The Incarnation of our Lord is said to be 'the legitimate climax of natural development' (p. 18), and 'the crown of natural development in the universe' (p. 43), as well as 'the consummation of nature's order' (p. 229). Interpreting the first two phrases by the third and by their context, we are led to think that Mr. Gore's meaning is that the Incarnation supplies what might reasonably be expected from a consideration of the natural world, and completes what without it must have remained incomplete; but we feel that many would understand the first phrase, if not also the second, to describe the Incarnation as a part, although the highest part, of the natural development itself.

It is likely that in the first man, on his creation, and after receiving the supernatural gifts of original righteousness, there was capacity for growth in fuller blessedness, and this is probably what Irenæus and Clemént of Alexandria mean in the passages¹ referred to on page 167, but the expression 'all the process of development of all human faculties lay before him' (p. 167) appears to us to be an overstatement. Mr. Gore's reference to the subject is too brief to make his exact meaning clear, but we do not think he sufficiently

¹ Irenæus, *C. Her.* iv. lxii.; Clem. Alex. *Strom.* vi. 12. Whatever the meaning of Clemént's words, there are reasons for carefully weighing any statement of his on such a subject: see Bigg, *Christian Platonists of Alexandria*, p. 81, note 1.

bears in mind the truth that in the first man, in addition to his natural condition, there was a supernatural gift of original righteousness because of which he was pleasing to God, and that it is this supernatural condition which it is the work of the Incarnation to restore.

'When the Church attributes to Adam, in his original state, holiness and justice, she by no means merely means that he was unpolluted with any alloy adverse to God . . . but, what is far more, that he stood in the most interior and closest communion with his Maker.'¹

'The guiding light . . . of original humanity was not merely that perfection of natural understanding which resulted from the happy constitution of man's inherent powers, but a special and supernatural indwelling of the great Author of all knowledge.'²

3. We are unable to agree with the view of our Lord's human knowledge which is somewhat confidently expressed. We think, in the first place, that due regard is not paid to the considerations which result from the recorded supernatural knowledge of our Lord. He discerned the thoughts of men;³ He foresaw the details of His Passion, Death, and Resurrection;⁴ He was aware that an individual touched his clothes when a crowd was pressing closely on Him,⁵ and that the illness of Lazarus had ended in death;⁶ He could tell the nature of the tree under which Nathaniel had been resting,⁷ the number of the husbands of the woman of Samaria,⁸ the value of the coin which was to be found in the fish's mouth,⁹ the exact place in the village where the colt would be found tied,¹⁰ the occupation in which the man who was to guide the disciples to the upper room would be engaged;¹¹ He knew of the denial of St. Peter both beforehand and at the moment when it took place.¹² Knowledge

¹ Möhler, *Symbolik*, B. I. cap. i. § 1.

² Wilberforce, *Doctrine of the Incarnation*, p. 48. See also Bull, *State of Man before the Fall*; Forbes, *Explanation of the Thirty-nine Articles*, pp. 140-2; Mozley, *Augustinian Doctrine of Predestination*, pp. 89-91, 103-5.

³ St. Matt. ix. 4, xii. 15, 25, xxvi. 21-5; St. Mark ii. 8, xii. 15, xiv. 18-21; St. Luke vi. 8, vii. 39, 40, xxii. 21, 22; St. John ii. 24, 25, vi. 70, 71, xiii. 21-6.

⁴ St. Matt. xvi. 21, xvii. 22, 23, xx. 18, 19, xxvi. 2; St. Mark viii. 31, ix. 9, 31, x. 33, 34; St. Luke ix. 22; xviii. 32, 33; St. John ii. 19-21, xii. 32, 33, xiii. 1-3, xviii. 4.

⁵ St. Mark v. 30-32; St. Luke viii. 45, 46.

⁶ St. John xi. 11-14.

⁷ St. John i. 48-50.

⁸ St. John iv. 17, 18.

⁹ St. Matt. xvii. 27, *στατήρα*.

¹⁰ St. Mark xi. 2; St. Luke xix. 30.

¹¹ St. Mark xiv. 13; St. Luke xxii. 10.

¹² St. Matt. xxvi. 34; St. Mark xiv. 30; St. Luke xxii. 34, 61; St. John xiii. 38.

of this kind is explained by Mr. Gore as 'supernatural illumination' which, 'if of higher quality,' is 'yet analogous to that vouchsafed to prophets and apostles' (p. 147), an explanation which is defended by the parallel of the 'divinely-given certainty in insight and foresight' (p. 155) of Jeremiah and other prophets. We do not think the two can be compared. The prophets were illuminated by a special gift of God. Our Lord's Humanity was not only filled with the Holy Ghost, it was also in personal union with the eternal Word. If the supernatural knowledge of our Lord's Humanity was due to the personal union with His Divine Nature as well as to the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, Mr. Gore's method of treating it ceases to be satisfactory.

In the second place, we do not think the evidence adduced to prove that our Lord as Man was ignorant of much makes out the case. That He should marvel at human unbelief¹ no more shows that he was ignorant than a statement about God that He looked on the sin of man as wonderful would declare that the Divine Being had not foreseen it. That He should ask questions does not prove want of knowledge. There are some questions which our Lord asks as rebukes, not as inquiries,² there are others where the question is a means of working out a conversation or an argument or the course of events,³ just as we frequently put something which we know in an interrogative form; on one occasion an Evangelist adds that our Lord asked in

¹ St. Mark vi. 6.

² St. Matt. viii. 26, ix. 4, xiv. 31, xv. 3, 16, xvi. (3), 8-11, xvii. 17, xix. 17, xxi. 16, 25, xxii. 18, xxiii. 33, xxvi. 10, 40, (50), 55; St. Mark ii. 8, iv. 13, 40, vii. 18, viii. 17-21, ix. 19, x. 18, xi. 17, xii. 15, xiv. 6, 37, 48; St. Luke v. 22, viii. 25, ix. 41, xii. 14, 56, 57, xiii. 15, 16, xvii. 17, (18), xviii. 19, (xx. 23), xxii. 46, 48, 52, xxiv. 38; St. John iii. 10, vii. 19, xviii. 21, 23.

³ St. Matt. v. 13, 46, 47, vi. 25-28, 30, vii. 3, 4, 9, 10, 16, ix. 5, 15, 28, x. 29, xi. 7-9, 16, (23), xii. 3-5, 11, 26, 27, 29, 34, 48, xiii. 51, xv. 17, 34, xvi. 13, 15, 26, xvii. 25, xviii. 12, xix. 4, 5, 17, xx. 21, 22, 32, xxi. 31, 40, 42, xxii. 20, 31, 32, 42-5, xxiii. 17, 19, xxiv. 2, 45, xxvi. 53, 54; St. Mark ii. 9, 19, 25, 26, iii. 4, 23, 33, iv. 21, 30, v. 9, 30, 39, vi. 38, vii. 18, 19, viii. 5, 12, 23, 27, 29, 36, 37, ix. (12), 21, 33, 50, x. 3, 18, 36, 38, 51, xi. 30, xii. 9, 10, 11, 16, 24, 26, 35-37, xiii. 2; St. Luke ii. 49, v. 23, 34, vi. 3-4, 9, 32-34, 39, 41, 42, 46, vii. 24-26, 37, 42, 44, viii. 30, 45, ix. 18, 20, 25, x. (15), 26, 36, xi. 5-7, 11-13, 18, 19, xii. 6, 25, 26, 28, 42, 49, 51, xiii. 2, 4, 15, 16, 18, 20, xiv. 3, 5, 28, 31, 34, xv. 4, 8, xvi. 11, 12, xvii. 7-9, xviii. 7, 8, 19, 41, xx. 4, 15, 17, 24, 41-4, xxii. 27, 35, xxiii. 31, xxiv. 17, 19, 26, 41; St. John i. 38, 50, ii. 4, iii. 12, iv. 25, v. 6, 44, 47, vi. 5, 61, 62, 67, 70, vii. 23, viii. 10, 46, ix. 35, x. 32, 34-36, xi. 9, 26, 34, 40, xiii. 12, 38, xiv. 9, 10, xvi. 19, 31, xviii. 4, 7, 11, 34, xx. 15, xxi. 5, 15-17, 22. A consideration of the references in this and the last note will show that the questions of our Lord after His Resurrection are exactly parallel to those before His death.

order to 'prove' His disciple, 'for He Himself knew what he would do ;'¹ on another the inquiry 'Who touched me ?' was at the very moment when He supernaturally knew of a special touch upon His clothes.² We think Mr. Gore's statement of the evidence of the Gospels on these particular points fails to be adequate because it wholly ignores considerations of the kind we have mentioned.³

The prayers of Jesus do not imply that He was ignorant. There may be real prayer for that which is foreseen. One of the senses in which we say 'Thy kingdom come' has reference to a future fact which we know to be certain. The prayers of men are among the foreseen conditions of God's foreseen working,⁴ and therefore our Lord, with knowledge of the future, might pray as Man. And when He thanked the Father for hearing His prayer at the raising of Lazarus, He added the words : 'I knew that Thou hearest me always, but because of the multitude which standeth around I said it.'⁵

The Agony in the Garden does not of necessity show a human ignorance in our Lord of what was possible in the purposes of God. The human soul which knows God's will and is unflinching in its resolve will say strange things in the agonies of its prayers. Into the mysterious calling upon God, which is the true prayer of unswerving resolution, it might well be the pattern Man might enter, knowing all the while in His Humanity that the purposes of God required His submission to the Cross.⁶

The like may be said of the Fourth Word from the Cross.⁷ The saints who know that God will never forsake them pray to Him that He will not ; the saints who know that in their darkness they have in reality been very close to God ask Him in their prayers why He has left them. The mysterious cry of our Lord has a real meaning if He was for a time without the enjoyment, though possessed of the reality, of the help of God, while none the less He knew that being personally Divine He could by no possibility be deserted by God. The Gospels make clear his consciousness that He was the Divine Son, and necessarily sinless, and for both reasons always in the favour of God.

¹ St. John vi. 5, 6.

² St. Mark v. 30, 31 ; St. Luke viii. 45.

³ We consider St. Matt. xxi. 19, St. Mark xi. 13 to be parallel to the inquiries which are simply used to work out the course of events : cf. e.g. St. Matt. xx. 32.

⁴ Cf. Liddon, *Elements of Religion*, p. 189.

⁵ St. John xi. 41, 42 ; cf. xii. 30.

⁶ St. John xii. 27 must be borne in mind in considering the Agony.

⁷ St. Matt. xxvii. 46 ; St. Mark xv. 34.

We cannot agree with Mr. Gore in the argument with reference to St. John's Gospel which we have already quoted at length. The passages he cites seem to us to be rather assertions of the truth that all which the Divine Son possesses or the Son of Man receives is possessed and received as a gift from the Father than to be indications of a limited message given by the Father to our Lord in His Humanity that he may impart it to others. If so, these passages have no special bearing on the particular question in the way in which they are quoted.¹

The 'argument from silence,' that our Lord 'never enlarges our stock of natural knowledge, physical or historical, out of the Divine Omniscience' (p. 150), does not appear to us to be of value. It would be in accordance with what we know of the purposes of the Incarnation that our Lord, even if fully acquainted with all facts of history and science, should not reveal these in His teaching.

So far, putting aside for the moment two single texts of very great importance, we have considered the evidence which the Gospels themselves present. We are led to think that such a consideration does not show signs of ignorance in our Lord as Man. The questions, the prayers, the cry from the Cross, the wonder, in our opinion afford less reason for thinking that He was ignorant than is afforded for believing that His knowledge was unlimited, so far as knowledge which a human mind can receive is concerned, by the facts in His Ministry to which we have referred.

We must notice next the two important passages we have hitherto put aside. It is said by St. Luke of our Lord in His childhood that He 'advanced in wisdom and stature, and in favour with God and men.'² Does this statement mean that our Lord, in His human mind, was gaining knowledge of which he had formerly been ignorant? We do not think it does. That may be at first sight the easiest interpretation of the words. Students know that interpretations which at first sight are easiest are often incorrect. True exegesis requires that a passage be considered in relation to all else which bears on the same subject.

¹ It is doubtful how St. John iii. 34, should be interpreted; see Westcott *in loco*. But if 'he' is interpreted of the Father, and the gift is to the Humanity of Christ, as the passage is cited in the lectures, the meaning appears to be opposite to that required by Mr. Gore's argument. Such an imperfect knowledge, corresponding to 'a message of definite content,' as is supposed in our Lord's human mind, would be the result of giving 'by measure.'

² St. Luke ii. 52.

real
sess
part
to t
sam
the
viou
our
mir
He
whi

can
as
Hi
ful
wit
ful
gra
int
He
ex

kn
bu
pr
pl
ei
th
of
th
di

C
ca
F
S
w

vi

I
x

It cannot be questioned that a man may go through a real process of acquiring knowledge which he already possesses. 'A man might determine, by admeasurement of parts, that the square of the hypotenuse was equal in area to the squares of the sides, and yet afterwards come to the same conclusion by reasoning.'¹ 'The telescope or the theodolite may verify a result of which we have been previously informed by a mathematical calculation.'² Similarly, our Lord might know all things from the first in His human mind by reason of its union with His Divine nature, while He acquired knowledge in experience by the processes through which men learn.

It may be said to us, 'You interpret "wisdom" as you cannot interpret "stature."' Yes; but we interpret 'wisdom' as we must interpret 'favour with God.' At the moment of His conception Jesus Christ was the well-beloved Son, in the fulness of the Divine favour. Yet He 'advanced in favour with God.' He who from the first enjoyed as Man in the fullest degree the favour of the Father, in another sense gradually grew in favour as His perfect holiness was translated into action by will and words and deeds. In like manner, He who as Man was from the first perfectly wise advanced in experience.

There is one passage more: 'Of that day or that hour knoweth no one, not even the angels in heaven, neither the Son, but the Father.'³ Of this verse there have been different interpretations in ancient and modern times. St. Athanasius explained it as a statement that the Son of Man was ignorant either actually in His human mind, or so far as the results of the exercise of His human faculties were concerned;⁴ St. Basil of the truth that the Son of God only knows by the gift of the Father;⁵ St. Augustine of a mere withholding from the disciples of the knowledge which our Lord actually possessed.⁶

¹ Wilberforce, *Doctrine of the Incarnation*, p. 72.

² Liddon, *Bampton Lectures*, p. 457.

³ St. Mark xiii. 32.

⁴ St. Athan. *Orat. c. Arian.* iii. 42-50; *De Incarn. et c. Arian.* vii. Cf. Irenæus, *C. Her.* ii. xlii. 3, xliii. 2, 3. There is some doubt, as indicated above, as to the meaning of St. Athanasius; see *Library of the Fathers—Select Treatises of St. Athanasius*, pp. 461, 462, 464-6, 468, 469. Some have thought Irenæus did not mean more than that the knowledge was derived from the Father.

⁵ St. Basil, *Ep.* 236 (al. 391); in *Ep.* 8 (al. 141) he mentions another view as possible.

⁶ St. Aug. *De Trin.* i. 23. Cf. St. Chrys. *In Mat. Hom.* on xxiv. 36; *In Act. Ap.* on i. 6; St. Ambr. *Expos. Luc.* viii. 34-36; *De Fide*, v. xvi.-xviii.; St. Cyr. Alex. *Thesaurus*, xxii., although there is some diffi-

To Archdeacon Wilberforce it was merely an assertion that our Lord did not know through the use of His human faculties;¹ to Dr. Liddon it was a declaration of a human ignorance of one specified fact on the part of the Son of Man, who in all other respects was omniscient;² to Mr. Gore it expresses a part of our Lord's habitual ignorance as Man of all which was not specially revealed to Him by the Father, or learnt in the ordinary course of life.³ The interpretation of St. Augustine, widely held as it has been within the Church, does not appear to us to satisfy the meaning of Christ's words. The other interpretations we have mentioned all seem to us to be possible in themselves. But we would point out that the probability of the explanation given by Mr. Gore depends on the value of the arguments from other passages we have shown reasons for setting aside, and that, apart from these, the most which could be based upon this one verse would be the opinion defended with great skill by the Bampton Lecturer for 1866.⁴ It follows that whether the human mind of our Lord was or was not ignorant of the one fact of the time of His second coming, there is no ground supplied by this passage for so extensive a nescience on the part of the Son of Man as Mr. Gore's position requires. And it is not to be forgotten that, in the discourse of which the verse forms part, our Lord was speaking with a very minute and accurate knowledge of many future details.

We have gone through, as fully as our space allows, the evidence of the Gospels on the human knowledge of our Lord. It is a question involved in many difficulties, but to ourselves, looking for the moment at the Gospels alone, the most probable view appears to be that our Lord throughout His human life was habitually possessed as Man of all the knowledge which it is possible for a human mind to contain.

Nor is this view inconsistent with St. Paul's description of the Incarnation by the words *ἐαυτὸν ἐκένωσεν*.⁵ The context shows that the meaning of this phrase is the possession of

culty in ascertaining the meaning of St. Ambrose and St. Cyril. There is a similar doubt about the opinion of St. Ephraim the Syrian, which would be of interest: see *In Script. Sermon. exeg.* on St. John xi. 43; *Adv. Scrutatores Sermon. xxvi. xxx. lxxvii.-lxxix.* (*Opp. Syr.* t. ii. pp. 391, 392, t. iii. pp. 47, 54, 142-8), and cf. the notes in the *Library of the Fathers—Select Works of St. Ephrem the Syrian*, pp. 190, 348-59.

¹ Wilberforce, *Doctrine of the Incarnation*, pp. 69-72. Cf. St. Greg. Mag. *Eph. x.* 39.

² Liddon, *Bampton Lectures*, pp. 458-67. Cf. Petavius, *De Incarn.* xl. ii. 1.

³ Gore, *Bampton Lectures*, p. 149.

⁴ Liddon, *ibid.*

⁵ Phil. ii. 7.

humanity and the consequent possibility of humiliation and suffering and death.¹

The opinion we have expressed is very strongly supported by the consideration of the Catholic doctrine of the Person of our Lord. His Manhood is indissolubly united with His Godhead in one Divine Person. All His human acts and words and thoughts are acts and words and thoughts of God. This makes certain His entire infallibility; it makes highly probable His complete knowledge. It is true that in the humiliation of the Incarnation He submitted Himself to hunger and thirst and weariness and death. But this is a different thing from the Divine Person withholding knowledge from the human mind in which He acted, and which was the mind of God. To speak of the voluntary withholding of knowledge by the Divine Person from His own human mind seems to us to ignore what the nature of knowledge implies.

We are in the presence of a stupendous mystery, which calls for restrained thoughts and guarded words. But to ourselves the consideration, both of Holy Scripture by itself and of the teaching of the Catholic Creeds points to a high probability that our Lord, in His human mind, knew all things which a human mind can receive,² as the same consideration makes certain that as Man He could neither sin nor err. And the extent to which the belief which we have expressed spread throughout the Church, though never made a matter of faith, is not, we think, to be ignored.

4. We deeply regret that Mr. Gore has repeated the opinion he has elsewhere expressed that our Lord's teaching has no bearing on particular questions of Old Testament criticism. Whatever be the facts about some details, a real Mosaic legislation, including Deuteronomy xxiv. 1, and Leviticus xii. 3, an historical Flood, a true history of Jonah, are, we

¹ Notice the connexion of thought in verses 7-8 and the grammatical construction of verse 7. Cf. Pearson, *Exposition of the Creed*, art. ii.: 'All the words together are but an expression of Christ's exinanition, with an explication showing in what it consisteth, which will clearly appear by this literal translation—But emptied Himself, taking the form of a servant, being made in the likeness of men. Where if any man doubt how Christ emptied Himself, the text will satisfy him, by taking the form of a servant; if any still question how He took the form of a servant, he hath the Apostle's resolution, by being made in the likeness of men. . . . As, therefore, His humiliation consisted in His obedience unto death, so his exinanition consisted in the assumption of the form of a servant, and that in the nature of man.'

² See St. Thom. Aq. *Summa Theologica*, III. x. 1-3; Petavius, *De Incarn.* XI. iii., *De Deo*, VII. iv.; Hooker, *Ecclesiastical Polity*, v. liv. 7.

think, imperatively required by the words of Christ.¹ We are unable to see that our Lord's reference to Psalm cx.² is of such a kind as to leave His infallibility and honesty unaffected if that Psalm was not written by David. And the inferences which thus are drawn with regard to the Old Testament would still, in our opinion, be rightly made, even on a view of ignorance in our Lord's human mind which we are not prepared to admit, since the appeal, the warning, the argument, are to us a real part of the teaching of Christ.

VI. In the seventeenth century one of the greatest theologians of the English Church thought a need of his time to be an exposition of Christian doctrine after the scholastic method.³ Twelve years ago the present Bishop of Rome urged upon his clergy the study of the schoolmen.⁴ It may be well for English Churchmen of the present day to consider words from sources so different.

In suggesting that the scholastic methods have lessons for ourselves, we take as our own words of Bishop Pearson :

'I am not one who would recall you from light to darkness, from the clearness of recovered literature to barbarism. I desire rather, with the fullest light from the sacred writings, to break into the very recesses of the school, and to put to flight whatever of darkness is there.'⁵

What are the conditions under which we may use the schoolmen to help us to a valuable system of Christian thought?

In the first place, we must make the right use of Holy Scripture. While we recognize the worth of the deutero-canonical books, we must keep quite clear the real distinction of the books which are proto-canonical. We must summon to our aid all critical helps. We must spare no pains to ascertain the true text and history, the true interpretation of each part, of the Old and New Testaments. The study of languages, of manuscripts, of versions, of schools of interpretation, of other sacred books, of history and archæology, must lie behind our use of the Bible.

¹ See St. Matt. xix. 8; St. Mark x. 3; St. John vii. 19, 22, 23; St. Matt. xxiv. 37; St. Luke xvii. 26; St. Matt. xii. 41; St. Luke xi. 32.

² St. Matt. xxii. 41-5; St. Mark xii. 35-7; St. Luke xx. 41-4.

³ Pearson, *Lectio* i. ('*Lectionum ratio et methodus, quare scholastica*') in *Minor Works* (ed. Churton), i. 1-9. Cf. p. lviii.

⁴ The Encyclical letter dated August 4, 1879, was reprinted in the edition of Aquinas now in course of publication at Rome, i. pp. iii.-xvi.

⁵ Pearson, *ibid.* p. 3.

W
autho
witho
repre
consi
comp
anoth
than
with
afraid
know
must
involv
round
W
ascert
are th
be afri
questi
in sho
in illu
within
Th
see ho
be mo
such
would
most
reveal
Is
Theol
with a
what
questi
trine
beliefs
years
of kn
ception
section
requir
much

¹ O
worth
xvii.

VOI

We must distinguish between the value of different authorities. We must not be content to quote a Father without ascertaining whether, on the point in question, he represents others besides himself. We must choose for our consideration writers of accepted position in the Church, and compare the opinions of these where they differ from one another. We must see that decrees of councils are more than local and temporary expressions of belief. In dealing with the opinions of men and of bodies of men, we must be afraid of anything which is individual. As we aim at the knowledge of the real meaning of Holy Scripture, so we must seek to know the real mind of the Church. And this involves the study of the history and influences which surround expressions of opinion both of writers and of councils.

We must welcome all secular learning as a means towards ascertaining what the Bible and the Church teach, and what are the needs of mind to which they correspond. We must be afraid to quote a non-Christian philosopher as deciding a question, but we must recognize his words as most valuable in showing the providential preparation for Christianity, and in illustrating the use of language and the process of thought within the Church.

Those who are acquainted with scholastic writings will see how greatly the details of this type of theology need to be modified if our conditions are true. We believe that under such conditions it may be of the very greatest service, for it would ensure the use of the highest human faculties in the most logical methods under the restraint of the truth revealed in Holy Scripture, and committed to the Church.¹

Is not a need of our time a great treatise on Dogmatic Theology? We want a book, on an adequate scale, written with adequate knowledge, which will state with completeness what the revealed truth is, what is of faith, what are open questions, where probabilities lie, what is the relation of doctrine to doctrine, what are reasons which show that our beliefs are true. It would, of necessity, be the work of many years and of many minds. Behind it must lie copious stores of knowledge of various kinds. Those who have any conception of the mental toil required for the mastery of one section of a single subject will recognize how great are the requirements of such a treatise as we have in view. Is it too much to hope that at some future time combined and self-

¹ On the need of restraint on philosophical reasonings it may be worth while to refer to St. Cyril Alex. *Thesaurus*, xi., *De recta Fide*, xvi., xvii.

effacing work of trained and gifted minds may give to the English Church, perhaps from some religious house, a worthy treatment of the Catholic Faith as a whole?

VII. We have strayed away from the Bampton Lectures for 1891, and the immediate subject of the Incarnation. In returning, we wish to express once more our sense of the high value of Mr. Gore's work. And if we may touch briefly a subject on which we could not dwell at length in the pages of a review, we may point out how the lectures bear the marks of the true generosity of one who has been willing to endanger his own peace of mind that he may help others more, and has therefore shrunk from entering into no perplexity or trouble or doubt or misbelief. And they show, too, the practical knowledge of the things of God and the keen sense of the thoughts of men which make the treatment of the Incarnation fruitful.

As we end a task which, if not untinged with regret, has been, for the most part, a work of thankfulness and joy, we quote a striking passage of personal appeal:

'You may depend upon it that you cannot be Christians by mere tradition or mere respectability. You will have to choose to be Christians. Let the figure of Christ, our Master, personal and living as of old, be before your eyes. He lays upon you a claim of service: varying as His vocations are various, as your faculties are various; as clergy and laity, apostles and disciples, married and celibate, saint and penitent, have their place in His kingdom: but upon all of you He lays the same claim of service, of purity, of sacrifice, of brotherhood. He will make His yoke easy and His burden light, in manifold ways, as His consolations are manifold, but in proportion as you take His yoke and accept His burden with thorough loyalty. If you will to be His disciple, He will enrich your life, He will purge it of its pollution, He will conquer your lusts, He will enlighten your mind, He will deepen in you all that is generous and rich and brotherly and true and just. He will make your life worth having—yea, increasingly worth having—as you gain in experience of His power and His love, even to the end. He will touch your sufferings and your labours with the glory of His sympathy; He will deepen your hopes for yourselves and others with the security of an eternal prospect. At the last He will purify and perfect and welcome you. Only do not make the fatal mistake of imagining that your life is Christian anyhow, or that it can be Christian by any other process than by your deliberate and courageous acceptance of the law of Christ, because you desire to be His disciple' (pp. 214, 215).

It is
be a
on a
impo
think
tian
the m
again
to or
of v
result

I
histo
The
view
the I
conc
of M
Chri
heret
the C

1
second
and i
Chris

2
prefac
only i

3
Trans
less, 1
parts,
velop
heave
recent

...
4
5
ducti
0

ART. II.—BISHOP ELLICOTT ON OLD TESTAMENT CRITICISM.

Christus Comprobator: or, the Testimony of Christ to the Old Testament. Seven Addresses by C. J. ELLICOTT, D.D., Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol. (London, n.d.)

IT is natural that the criticism of the Old Testament should be a prominent subject of thought at the present time. For on all sides it is agreed that certain critical questions have an important bearing on theological belief. There are those who think that some of these questions vitally affect central Christian truth;¹ there are others who regard them as affecting the methods of revelation by which God teaches man;² others, again, consider that on them the relation of religious systems to one another largely depends.³ Different as are the points of view, there is agreement as to the importance of the results.

It may be well for us to trace, as briefly as possible, the history of the criticism of some parts of the Old Testament. The Christian Church inherited from the Jews a traditional view of the authorship of the Hebrew books. Among these, the Pentateuch, either wholly⁴ or with the exception of the concluding verses of Deuteronomy,⁵ was regarded as the work of Moses. This view formed the ordinary belief in the Christian Church from the first century onwards. Some heretical sects rejected the Old Testament altogether, and the Clementine Homilies⁶ regarded the Pentateuch as per-

¹ See, e.g., Liddon, *The Worth of the Old Testament*, preface to second edition, p. 14: 'That question is whether He with whom, in life and in death, we Christians have to do, is a fallible or the infallible Christ.'

² See, e.g., Driver, *Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament*, preface, p. xv: 'Those conclusions affect not the *fact* of revelation, but only its *form*.'

³ See, e.g., Kuenen, *The Religion of Israel*, i. pp. 5, 11, 12 (English Translation): 'For us the Israelitish is one of those religions, nothing less, but also nothing more;' 'its' (*i.e.* of the Old Testament) 'separate parts, regarded by the light of criticism, speak loudly for a natural development both of the Israelitish religion itself and of the belief in its heavenly origin;' 'among the causes which have given rise to the more recent view of Israel's religion, the critical study of the Old Testament . . . could not be forgotten.'

⁴ Phil. Jud. *Vita Moys.* iii. 39; Joseph. *Antiq.* iv. viii. 48.

⁵ *Tr. Baba Bathra*, fol. 14, in the Talmud, cit., e.g. Bleek, *Introduction to the Old Testament*, § 68.

⁶ Clem. Hom. ii. 38, iii. 47.

verted and corrupted by false prophets from the law which Moses had given orally to the seventy elders, but within the Church it was taken for granted that it was the work of Moses.¹ In the twelfth century Aben Ezra² expressed his opinion that some passages had been added at a date later than the time of Moses; in the sixteenth century Andreas Maseas³ thought that parts of the present book are due to re-editing; a century later Hobbes⁴ and Spinoza⁵ attacked the Mosaic authorship. But with these and a few other exceptions, it was held that the five books were written by Moses. An epoch in criticism was made by the publication of a work by Dr. Astruc⁶ in 1753, in which an attempt was made to distinguish by internal evidence, starting from the use of different names for God, a number of authors in the book of Genesis, which was regarded as having been compiled from the writings of these by Moses. From that time to the present very many writers have thought it clear that the Pentateuch was a compilation by one process or another from various sources, and of late it has become common to assume that but little is Mosaic, and the whole, in its present form, later than the Exile.

A similar process has taken place in the case of the Psalms. Formerly, the titles were regarded as indicating the authors of the Psalms to which they are attached. Now, very many writers reject the titles altogether as untrustworthy, and it is held by some that no Psalm is by David, by others that only a very few of those ascribed to him are his composition. So, again, the book of Isaiah has been divided into parts and assigned to two or more authors; and the book

¹ Bishop Perowne in the *Dictionary of the Bible*, ii. 770, states his opinion that 'Jerome . . . had seen the difficulty of supposing the Pentateuch to be altogether, in its present form, the work of Moses.' The passage he there quotes from St. Jerome does not appear to mean more than that occasional chronological notes (*e.g.*, the continuance of the ignorance of the place where Moses was buried) may have been added by Ezra. The words quoted and part of the context (*C. Helvid.* vii.) are: 'Certe hodiernus dies illius temporis æstimandus est, quo historia ipsa contexta est, sive Moysen dicere volueris auctorem Pentateuchi, sive Ezram ejusdem instauratorem operis, non recuso. Nunc hoc quæritur, an id quod dictum est, *usque in diem istum*, ad illam referatur ætatem, qua libri editi sive conscripti sunt.'

² See, *e.g.*, Bleek, *Introduction to the Old Testament*, § 68.

³ See, *e.g.*, Bleek, *ibid.*, § 69; Cornely, *Historica et critica Introductio in utriusque Testamenti libros sacros*, vol. ii. pars i. p. 20.

⁴ Hobbes, *Leviathan*, chap. xxxiii.

⁵ Spinoza, *Tractatus Theologico-Politicus*, chap. viii. ix.

⁶ Astruc, *Conjectures sur les Mémoires originaux, dont il paroît que Moïse s'est servi pour composer le livre de Genèse*.

of Da
centu
past.

C.
Old T
parts
has b
speci
which
canno
whom
increa
of the

T
nions
aided
in rel
Delit
the c
the k
ferenc
so em

T
face.
ferreo
Chris
have

F
great
Testam
David
he acc

K
V
414-17
Britan
Judah

I
Dr. D
which
in Chr
the Ea
pret G
believ
God.'

C
I
ductio

of Daniel regarded as a late work, probably of the second century B.C., describing in a prophetic form events then past.

Criticism has been at work, also, upon the contents of the Old Testament books. The historical character of the early parts of Genesis and, for instance, the narrative of Jonah, has been increasingly attacked. It has been thought that the speeches in the books of the Chronicles and the addresses which form the greater part of the book of Deuteronomy cannot, by any possibility, have been delivered by those to whom they are assigned. Thus, different types of criticism, increasingly prevalent, have been demanding a changed view of the history and character of the Old Testament writings.¹

The demand has been made by critics of different opinions. With Professors Kuenen² and Wellhausen³ it has aided an attempt to destroy belief in the supernatural element in religion; in more moderate writers, such as Professor Delitzsch,⁴ it has been accompanied by expressed belief in the central truths of Christianity; in England a position of the kind referred to has been defended, with important differences in the treatment of details, by members of the Church so eminent as Dr. Cheyne⁵ and Dr. Driver.⁶

Thus, a great problem has arisen which the Church must face. It cannot be said that the critical theories we have referred to are the work only of those who are the enemies of Christianity or of religion. Earnest and learned Christians have adopted them with greater or less fulness. Many who

¹ For statements of the views of authorship referred to, expressed with great moderation, see Driver, *Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament*. Dr. Driver thinks it doubtful whether any Psalm is by David. On the Pentateuch, Isaiah, Daniel, the Chronicles, Deuteronomy, he accepts the opinions which have been described.

² Kuenen, *Religion of Israel*, i. 5-12 (English translation).

³ Wellhausen, *Prolegomena to the History of Israel*, pp. 241, 242, 344, 414-17 (English translation); *Israel* (reprinted from *Encyclopædia Britannica*), pp. 430, 439, 449 (also in *Sketch of the History of Israel and Judah*, pp. 3, 4, 19, 20, 41, 42).

⁴ In his *New Commentary on Genesis*, published at Leipzig in 1887, Dr. Delitzsch accepted the main conclusions of the school of critics, which is referred to. But he expressed emphatically his continued belief in Christianity; see vol. i. pp. v, 57 (English translation), 'I believe in the Easter announcement, and I accept its deductions'; 'We will interpret Genesis as theologians, and indeed as Christian theologians, i.e. as believers in Jesus Christ, who is the end of all the ways and words of God.'

⁵ Cheyne in, e.g., *Bampton Lectures*, pp. ix-xxxiv.

⁶ Driver, *Contemporary Review*, February, 1890, pp. 215-31; *Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament*.

are patiently seeking to know what the truth is are feeling their way towards them. Others are perplexed and cannot tell what to think. Among those who, without doubt, wish to believe the Faith of Christ there is perplexity, or movement towards the new opinions, or acceptance of them. And in proportion to the extent with which it has been realized that Holy Scripture contains the revelation of truth and the law of righteousness, and that the authority of Christ supplies the Christian's highest rule, there has been anxiety lest new views about the Old Testament should in any way lessen the value of the Bible or the teaching of our Lord.

In this condition of affairs a gifted English Churchman made an attempt to lessen the strain. The Principal of Pusey House added to a careful account of the work of the Holy Spirit in the Church a short statement on the relation of the Christian belief in Inspiration to some critical opinions. It seemed to him, on the one hand, that 'the modern development of historical criticism is reaching results as sure, where it is fairly used, as scientific inquiry,'¹ and, on the other hand, that the Christian Faith does not require belief in the historical character of the early parts of Genesis or the story of Jonah, in the utterance by Moses of the law 'put dramatically into his mouth'² in the book of Deuteronomy, or in a particular view of the authorship of any of the Psalms. He therefore considered it his duty, as a Christian teacher, to endeavour to remove 'great obstacles from the path to belief of many who certainly wish to believe,'³ by declaring these matters to be open questions for those who desire to be loyal to our Lord and the Faith of the Church.

No one who has rightly considered Mr. Gore's statement can doubt that his aim was to remove perplexity, to lessen unsettlement, to enable earnest inquirers to rest in the Faith of Christ. It formed a part of a book which was intended to 'succour a distressed faith.'⁴ The essay was very differently received in different quarters. It was welcomed by a Biblical critic as rightly stating the matter;⁵ it was condemned as conceding points where concession is not compatible with loyalty to our Lord by a preacher and dogmatic theologian;⁶ if it set at rest the doubts of any, it created a widespread sense of distress, and in some cases unsettled

¹ *Lux Mundi*, p. 357.

² *Ibid.* p. 355.

³ *Ibid.* p. 361.

⁴ *Ibid.* p. 4.

⁵ Driver, *Contemporary Review*, February 1890, p. 231.

⁶ Liddon, *Worth of the Old Testament*, p. 19-25, and preface to the second edition.

belief. We ourselves were among the number of those who thought that a mistake had been made and that the latter part of the essay, which was written to render belief in Christ less difficult, would in the end be found to be inconsistent with the truth of His infallibility.

Is, then, nothing to be done? Are those who agree with ourselves simply to stand aside and repeat, without explanation or defence, the old belief? We think an important task lies before Christian theologians and critics of our time. If the writers in *Lux Mundi* had appealed for a reconsideration, within certain limits, of much which is frequently taught about the Old Testament, we should have been among the first to welcome such an appeal. We think there is need of a great deal of patient investigation and cautious statement with regard to these books. There are many problems the right answer to which may ultimately be found to be of a somewhat different kind than has, in the past, been commonly given. But there are limits to the conclusions which are compatible with a belief in Inspiration and the acceptance of Christianity. It is the task of a theological teacher, as distinct from a Biblical critic, to endeavour to lay down what those limits are. It is the duty of a Biblical critic who loyally accepts the Faith of Christ to respect them.

Thus, as it seems to us, there has been a need of a full and careful investigation of what the idea of Inspiration and the authority of Christ really require. There is reason, as we think, to be afraid of sweeping statements. When we hear it said, on the one side, that our Lord, by His use of the Old Testament, ratified all the Jewish beliefs about questions of authorship, or, on the other side, that in such matters He ratified nothing at all, we are struck by the rashness of both statements alike. And when we meet with a theory that the verbal accuracy of every detail which natural knowledge would supply, such as a number or a date, is a necessity in an inspired work, or, on the other hand, with a claim that there is nothing inconsistent with Inspiration in wide departures from truth, whether by unconscious idealizing or by intentional deceit, and in the representation of legend as fact, and of historical events as predictions of the future, we feel that something more than caution is required. And in the use of the Bible by Christian writers there is need to distinguish between interpretations or methods which are local, or temporary, or individual and the settled doctrine which universally and permanently underlies the appeal to Scripture, and is therefore bound up with the Faith of the Church.

Moreover, there is need of critical study of the Old Testament definitely from the Christian point of view. It may make all the difference in a study of this kind whether we begin with a belief in the miraculous and the supernatural, or without it. Such a belief will shed light on passages which, from a merely natural point of view, cannot be explained. It will lead us to expect features which in a merely natural work could not be found. Supernatural provision for foreseen circumstances, definite and detailed prophecy, frequent miracles should cause no difficulty to those who approach the Old Testament as the revelation of God in preparation for the life of which the Resurrection and the Ascension were the climax. And in a large number of critical details the judgment of the mind which is steadily regarding the book as supernatural as well as natural will be different from that from the merely natural point of view. It can hardly be too deeply regretted that English criticism has derived so much from foreign writers who, to say the least, have not always been positively Christian. For the bias against the supernatural which has influenced them has its effect, often not allowed for, on those whose work is based on their investigations.

We believe, then, that an examination in detail of the whole of our Lord's references to the Old Testament is a necessary part of any attempt to answer the question what belief is required from Christians on the points of authorship and history which His teaching touches, that a careful study of the use made of the Old Testament by our Lord and the New Testament writers and the Christian Fathers generally must precede any decision as to what is necessarily implied in the idea of Inspiration, and that right conclusions in Old Testament criticism are likely to be reached only by those who study it from the Christian standpoint.

The Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol selected the criticism of the Old Testament as the subject of the Charge which he delivered in October and November 1890, and has now published this Charge in the form of a book. One of the most important features of the work is the statement of the 'traditional view' of the Old Testament in the form in which the Bishop thinks it may rightly, and ought to be, held. He recognizes to a large extent the use of previously existing documents by the sacred writers. 'Genesis was *compiled* by Moses,' who probably used 'primeval documents' for the earlier parts, and 'family records of a distinctly contemporaneous origin' for the later chapters, and

Testa-
y make
gin with
without
from a
It will
al work
een cir-
miracles
the Old
the life
climax.
t of the
tural as
merely
gretted
foreign
n posi-
natural
allowed
ns.
of the
nt is a
n what
horship
il study
and the
generally
implied
in Old
y those

'arranged' and 'illustrated them by contemporary notes' (pp. 46, 47). Exodus and Leviticus were written either by Moses himself or by scribes directed by him. Numbers was 'compiled—in part from the legislative revelation made directly to Moses, in part from contemporary records made by Moses in obedience to God's command (Numb. xxxiii. 2; see also Exod. xvii. 14), in part from documentary annals, including references to books (Numb. xxi. 14, 21) that may have been compiled during the lengthened abode in the wilderness—but all, as the tenor of the whole Book and its concluding verse seem distinctly to imply, under the authority and general oversight of Moses.' Deuteronomy contains 'the addresses of the closing days of the inspired legislator,' and 'assumed its present form . . . under the hand of Joshua' (pp. 47, 48). The book of Joshua was 'compiled by some contemporary writer or writers under the direction of Joshua,' partly 'from communications personally made by Joshua,' partly 'from documents and records made at the time by official writers and recorders.' The book of Judges is described as 'a compilation, not improbably made by the prophet Samuel, from contemporary records, family memorials, and other existing materials' (pp. 48, 49). The books of Samuel and the Kings were compiled, possibly with additions, 'by seers and prophetic writers,' partly from 'compositions of contemporary prophets,' partly from 'selected materials from official records, sacred and secular,' Jeremiah being the last, and possibly 'one of the principal' writers. The books of the Chronicles 'were a compilation, possibly—nay, even probably—by Ezra, made largely from the books of Kings, or from the documents on which these books were based, but with abundant references and allusions to nearly all the earlier historical books, including the Pentateuch' (p. 49). The books of Ezra and Nehemiah were the work of those writers, 'and contain, in part, extracts from official documents and from contemporary records; and also, in part, narratives of personal history' (p. 50). The prophetic books were written by the authors whose names are specified, and while containing, 'in some instances, portions of contemporary history,' they are mainly 'predictive,' and refer to events which were to happen at a date later than the time at which the prophecies were made. An important consideration is added to this account of the composition of the various books:

'The historical books, as we now have them, bear plain and unmistakable marks of the work having passed through the hands, not

only of the early compiler or compilers, but of later editors and revisers—numerous notes, archæological and explanatory, some obviously of an early, and some of a late date, being found in all the books, but particularly in the more ancient' (p. 50).

It is with great thankfulness that we have read this clear restatement of the 'traditional view' with the modifications which the Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol thinks to be necessary. For while we are not certain that the arguments upon which the composite character of parts of the Pentateuch is asserted are as clear as they are considered by some,¹ and remember there are critics who do not recognize the necessity of admitting the addition of any notes after the time of Moses,² and while, on the other hand, the idea that the problem is solved by such a solution as the Bishop's is regarded with scorn by those who accept the modern theories,³ it seems to us that by far the most probable view is that which we have described.⁴ And it may be worth while to recall how closely it coincides with the opinion of the late Dr. Edersheim, whose authority on such a question is necessarily of great weight:

'The legislation of the Pentateuch is of Mosaic authorship and of Divine authority; . . . the settlement of Israel in the land was followed by a period of religious decay and decadence, which called for the interposition of the Prophets, who pointed back to the Law, and explained and applied its deeper spiritual meaning; . . . this decadence continued, with brief interruptions, throughout the period of the Kings, thus further calling for the continued activity of the Prophets.

'The Pentateuch' may 'consist of several original documents or sources, welded together by one or more redactors. And there may

¹ That is, in some even of the more moderate forms. In some writings the extent to which it is proposed to distinguish the source of the smallest portions appears to us unreasonable. See, e.g., Kautzsch and Socin, *Die Genesis mit äusserer Unterscheidung der Quellenschriften*. It is fair to add that the authors of this work do not claim certainty for their details. But some of the conclusions of these and other critics are instructive from the point of view we have indicated.

² See, e.g., Keil, *Commentary on the Pentateuch*, i. 17-28, iii. 517-31 (English translation), and *passim* in the Commentary; Cornely, *Historica et critica Introductio in utriusque Testamenti libros sacros*, vol. ii. pars i. pp. 1-160.

³ See, e.g., Driver, *Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament*, preface, p. xiv: 'The hypothesis of glosses and marginal additions is a superficial remedy: the fundamental distinctions upon which the main conclusions of critics depend remain untouched.'

⁴ That is, as satisfying the positive evidence which we believe exists in favour of the 'traditional view,' and at the same time accounting for much which is difficult on that view as sometimes presented.

even be emendations and additions—glosses, if you like to call them so—by redactors, revisers, or final editors.’¹

And if there are any who, in the interests of orthodoxy, are afraid of such a view, it may reassure them to be reminded that the method of selection was affirmed by Dr. Liddon in his last great defence of the Inspiration of God’s Word,² and that he expressed his wishfulness for a reassertion ‘in the main, and with the necessary reservations,’ of ‘the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch.’³

In sharp contrast to his presentation of the traditional view, Bishop Ellicott sets the opposite theory.

‘The results of the Analytical theory, as arrived at by its most acute foreign critics, may be thus briefly summarized :—

‘1. That the Old Testament did not assume its present form till a somewhat late date in the period of the Exile.

‘2. That the later historical books, and especially the two books of Chronicles, disclose methods of constructing history which justify the limited estimate which has been formed of the trustworthiness of the earlier books, and prepare us for the inferences that have been drawn from a critical investigation of them.

‘3. That this critical investigation, in the case of the Pentateuch and the book of Joshua, . . . discloses at least three strata of narrative and legislative details, of different dates and distinctive peculiarities, which, after having been revised and re-edited, possibly several times, have at last been not unskilfully combined in the form in which they have now come down to us.

‘4. That the three strata more particularly to be recognized are (a) a History Book—itsself composite, . . . dating from the period of the early kings and prophets ; (b) the book of Deuteronomy, compiled in the days of Manasseh or Josiah by some unknown writer . . . ; (c) a document, in its earliest state of perhaps the same date as (a), historical only in form, . . . which, after having been carefully revised, became expanded in the time of the Exile into what is called the Priestly Code, its basis being Leviticus and allied portions of Exodus and Numbers.

‘5. That the three Codes of Law found in the Pentateuch conform to and corroborate this analysis.

‘6. That in the present books of Judges, Samuel, and Kings we have remodelled history, and a repainting of the original picture on a generally uniform principle, and with some reference to Deuteronomy—the accretions and corruptions in the books of Samuel being numerous . . . ; and the revision of the books of Kings being

¹ Edersheim, *Prophecy and History in Relation to the Messiah*, pp. 231–33.

² Liddon, *Inspiration of Selection*, p. 12.

³ See Stanley Leathes, *The Law in the Prophets*, pref. p. xii. In considering the possible extent of later additions to a Mosaic work, the bearing of Deut. iv. 2, xii. 32, on the question must be estimated.

also very unrestricted, though closer to the facts than in Judges or Samuel.

'7. That the Prophets used history as a vehicle for their own ideas ; and that their so-called predictions are only fallible anticipations of the manner in which, according to their conceptions, the Deity would, consistently with the character they ascribed to Him, deal with the subjects of His government. . . .

'8. That thus . . . we are to regard the book of Deuteronomy as a fiction, founded it may be on traditions, and of no earlier date probably than the eighteenth year of Josiah ; that the Tabernacle of witness . . . and everything connected with it, had never any existence except in the fabricated history composed in the days of the Exile . . . ; that the older books were remodelled according to the Mosaic form, and that Chronicles, especially, was falsified by Priests and Levites to sustain the belief that the tribe of Levi had been set apart from the days of Moses, and that the Priesthood dated from that time—such a view being, it is alleged, utterly inconsistent with the truth' (pp. 52-55).

We have quoted largely from this description of the 'analytical theory' because we think it states with great clearness and accuracy the position of an influential school of critics. Bishop Ellicott next carefully describes the attitude of Dr. Driver and Mr. Gore, which is doubtless familiar to our readers. He then compares it with the 'analytical theory':

'The difference in tenor between the two groups of statements is slight ; . . . it is impossible to regard the statements of the English writers as otherwise than expressive of a general acceptance of the analytical view ; modified, it will be observed, in certain details, and minimised, to some extent, in phraseology, but, when thus modified, in no degree approximating to the rectified traditional view, or to be regarded as a mediating statement between the two theories' (p. 58).

We agree with the Bishop that the acceptance of the position advocated by Dr. Driver, and allowed as consistent with full Christian belief by Mr. Gore, would naturally lead on to the unmodified theory of such writers as Professor Wellhausen. But we do not think he quite sufficiently allows in one place for the difference which actually exists between the two positions as now held. The questions of a revelation to Moses, and of the method of composition of the books of Deuteronomy and the Chronicles, are important points. To the advanced school the history of a revelation to Moses is simply a fiction.¹ Mr. Gore has said that the 'results' of

¹ Wellhausen, *Prolegomena to the History of Israel*, pp. 344, 417 (English translation) ; *Israel* (reprinted from *Encyclopædia Britannica*), p. 439 (also in *Sketch of the History of Israel and Judah*, pp. 19, 20).

criticism which he regards as being 'as sure as scientific inquiry' are those advocated rather by König than by Wellhausen.¹ According to König, God revealed himself to Moses and made a covenant with Israel on Sinai.² To the advanced school, Deuteronomy and Chronicles were deliberately falsified to support different stages of a sacerdotal theory.³ Dr. Driver considers that the 'original representation' was 'insensibly modified, and sometimes' 'coloured by the associations of the age in which the writer recording it lived.'⁴ We are ourselves most strongly opposed to the view which affirms what is known as the 'unconscious idealizing of history,'⁵ as being, in our opinion, contrary to the idea of the Inspiration of the God of truth, as forming part of a whole critical theory which we regard as unsound, and as leading up to disastrous consequences in theology. But we think it due to justice, and expedient for the proper consideration of the controversy, to express our opinion that there is a real distinction between such a position and that of the more extreme critics. This, indeed, the Bishop himself clearly states in a sentence which follows the passage we have quoted from p. 59, but we doubt whether it is fully kept in view in the passage itself.

After placing the traditional and analytical views side by side, the Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol proceeds to consider their relative probability. A comparison shows that there are three fundamental differences between them. The first is that 'the traditional view presupposes the supernatural and miraculous,' while 'some' 'advocates' of 'the analytical view' 'assume from the very first a naturalistic basis, and regard the miraculous as the most certain indication of the unhistorical and untrustworthy.' Even the advocates of the more modified forms of the view are not free from this characteristic: it is an indication of it that they 'dispose of the first eleven chapters of Genesis as a product of mental

¹ *Lux Mundi*, preface to tenth edition, p. xx.

² König, *Offenbarungsbegriff des Alten Testaments*, ii. 333-36, especially p. 333, 'Ich, für meinen Theil, nun muss mit aller Entschiedenheit betonen, dass dem Mose eine wahrhaft übernatürliche Offenbarung zu theil geworden ist, dass durch ihn Gott auf wunderbare Weise Israel aus Aegypten geführt hat, dass durch ihn Gott am Sinai mit Israel einen Bund geschlossen.' Cf. Edersheim, *Prophecy and History in Relation to the Messiah*, p. 232, n¹.

³ Wellhausen, *Prolegomena to the History of Israel*, pp. 5, 6, 9, 10, 26, 33, 41, 171-227 (English translation); Kuenen, *Religion of Israel*, ii. 18, 19 (English translation).

⁴ Driver, *Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament*, preface, p. xvii.

⁵ *Lux Mundi*, p. 353.

activity, not yet distinguished into history and poetry, or in other words as *mythical*' (p. 64). The views differ, secondly, 'in the general character they present of the Old Testament history' (pp. 66, 67):

'According to the traditional view the character of the Old Testament history is perfectly natural and simple. It begins with what may be termed the preliminary and pre-historic. It speedily passes into family history, presenting each leading character with a freshness that seems to tell of contemporary recording, and of a studious preservation of archives. . . . The family history in the fulness of time passes into national history; the laws that are to bind the nation together are enunciated, and afterwards supplemented, when the entry of the nation into the promised land seemed to require final additions and enhancements. The stream of national history is still represented as flowing onward, but under just such limitations as the tribal separations and the apportioned settlements in a newly occupied and hostile country would be certain to involve. So, for four hundred years, the national history reflects the existing state of the national life, and we have in the book of Judges just the brief and epitomized record which seems exactly to correspond with the circumstances. With the establishment of the monarchy we pass into a different stratum of the national history. The contemporaneous nature of the record becomes again more patent and defined, and the history of the Covenant people more completely answering to the character which is to be traced throughout of simplicity, fidelity, and truth' (pp. 67, 68).

On the other hand, the analytical view presents to us the history in a widely different character:

'The simplicity which we have seemed to trace in it disappears. In its earlier portions it is . . . highly composite. In its succeeding portions it has become . . . remodelled, interpolated, and rehandled; and we have no longer to do with the various elements of the unfolding story of a nation, but, almost exclusively, with the efforts of a priestly party' (p. 68).

Thirdly, the purpose and design differ:

'Under the traditional view the whole object of the narrative is to set forth the history of the Covenant people, and God's dealings with the nation from which, as according to the flesh, the Saviour of the world was to come. Under the analytical view all this becomes subordinated to the one dominant principle of establishing the priestly code, and consolidating priestly authority' (p. 69).

The Bishop's statements, of course, apply fully only to the more extreme forms of the analytical view, and in proportion as that view is modified by more moderate critics they will apply to a less extent. But they will not altogether cease to

apply even to the most moderate forms. It is, we believe, an instance of the principle which underlies the first statement of difference which leads some writers to assume that the early parts of Genesis were, in their original form, altogether parallel to the early legends found elsewhere, and received their monotheistic framing at a later date, after some progress had been made in the development of religious thought,¹ instead of regarding their theological truth as due to primitive revelation. And, similarly, the simplicity and settled design are marred even when the incorrect accounts and later colouring are due not to deliberate falsification, but to unconscious idealizing.²

Bishop Ellicott considers some of the leading objections which may be urged against the traditional view in its 'rectified form' (p. 70). The minute ritual and ceremonial laws which some have thought could not form 'part of the desert legislation' (p. 71) may be explained, he thinks, either because 'these apparently trivial matters are specified as illustrations of the wide ethical bearing to which the primary commandments were to be understood to extend,' or as 'additions made at a much later period, at one of the so-called re-editings or revisions through which it is admitted

¹ This opinion is expressed in, e.g., Moorhouse, *Teaching of Christ*, pp. 6-8. It appears to be regarded as possible that the primitive religion was polytheism in *Lux Mundi*, p. 71.

² There is a powerful statement of part of the argument from general probability in Watson, *The Law and the Prophets* (the Hulsean Lectures for 1882), pp. 23, 24: 'The modern theory of the Old Testament seems to me to overthrow that preparation for Christ which we saw was at once so beautiful and so necessary. When we have been reading our Old Testament, we have seen—or did we only think we saw?—a gradual development in God's dealings with the race. The Patriarchal, the Law-giving, the Prophetical ages seemed to follow one another in due course. There was a period of Infancy, when laws were few and simple. There was a period of Youth, when laws were many and to be obeyed for obedience sake. There was a period of Manhood, when principles gradually took the place of laws, when exterior obedience was as nothing except as the fruit of the interior obedience of the heart. But if the traditional theory is, as a whole, a confusion and a mistake; if the earliest books are the latest, and the latest the earliest; if the basis of the teaching is in reality the development; if the spiritual principles came first, and the formal principles afterwards; if first you have the freedom of the man, and then the bondage of the child; if the facts which teach divine truths more powerfully than words are only mythical embodiments of those truths; then it must be confessed that the picture of God's dealings in the Old Testament, on which we have so often gazed with admiration and delight, is a creation of human fancy. However beautiful, it is not true. The development of the Old Testament is a stage development, not a development of real life. The record of the life of the human race is not a history, but a romance.'

in the traditional view that the Pentateuch and other historical books did probably pass' (p. 72). The absence of 'traces of the observance of the Mosaic law' 'in the long period that ensued between the entry into Canaan and the times of the earlier kings' is explained on the ground that 'the circumstances of the occupation of Canaan, and the utterly different state of things between the national union of the wilderness and the sharply defined local separations in Canaan,' make it 'not only' 'likely' 'but' 'certain' 'that many laws would remain in abeyance, and would only pass out of that state when the national union became again more of a reality; and when, by the establishment of a theocratic centre, the necessarily suspended ordinances could by degrees be put into use and complied with' (pp. 73, 74). To the objection 'that the Old Testament history is' 'honeycombed with anachronisms, contradictions, repetitions and inconsistencies of every varied form' (p. 75), the Bishop's answer is twofold. Such features are, he says, far fewer than has very commonly been supposed, and assuming that 'a very small proportion' of them does exist, 'its presence can very reasonably be accounted for' when it is remembered that 'compilation' from earlier documents, addition of 'explanatory and illustrative notes' (p. 76), and successive editing are admitted.

The difficulties in the way of acceptance of the analytical view are said to be greater and more fundamental than those which have been considered in reference to the traditional view. It is unreasonable to regard the unhistorical character of the earlier records as necessitated by 'the pure and elevated religious views that are found in' them,¹ or 'to crush into the period of the Exile' the 'vast amount of fabricated legislation and re-written history' which the theory supposes to be due to that time, leaving the earlier periods almost wholly without literature. It is contrary to common sense to reduce the legislation of Moses into 'a few primal laws and a few covenant obligations' (p. 80) when he is regarded by 'all the traditions, history, and literature of Israel' 'as the great prophet who was the founder of the national greatness,' and as the 'author and origin,' 'under

¹ The argument is Kuenen's: see his *Religion of Israel*, i. 108 (English translation). There is a good criticism upon it in Watson, *ibid.* p. 66: 'The religious ideas of the patriarchs are pure, but they are very simple. Patriarchal simplicity is a characteristic of the patriarchal religion. Their conception of God is high and true, but it differs from that of the prophets, as the truth before controversy differs from the truth after it.'

God,' of 'every law' (pp. 80, 81). Nothing short of 'literary jugglery and a real misuse of words' can make the book of Deuteronomy anything else but 'conscious fraud' (pp. 82, 83), if the addresses it contains were not delivered by Moses. It is 'preposterous' to suppose that the 'description of the Tabernacle' was imagined and invented in the time of the Exile, or that the writer of the Chronicles 'deliberately falsified the books of Samuel and Kings,' and 'the resolution of what is commonly understood as prophecy into sagacious calculation of what might probably take place is absolutely irreconcilable with' (pp. 84, 85) the words of the prophets themselves.

The force of the group of arguments which the Bishop thus puts forward is again relative to the particular form of the analytical view which is under consideration. Against the extreme forms they have their full weight; against the more modified forms, common in England, they have, we think, a good deal. There is much to be said, simply on the ground of general probability, against the tendency to deny early dates to any number of parts of the Old Testament, or against any theory which deprives Moses of his place as a real law-giver; while it is plainly doing violence to the book of Deuteronomy itself to suppose that its words were not spoken by Moses,¹ and to the statements with regard to prophecy to minimize the supernaturally predictive character of the foresight of the prophets.

The remaining and larger part of *Christus Comprobator* is devoted to a discussion of the bearing of the teaching of our Lord on Old Testament criticism. The rightfulness of the appeal to Christ in such a matter, and the belief that He was not in His human mind ignorant of the true history and character of the sacred Scriptures, are vindicated. The nature of His references to the Old Testament is carefully examined. The consideration of His general attitude, and of His use of particular passages, leads to the conclusions that He ratified the Davidic authorship of Psalm cx. and the main features of the traditional view of the legislation of Moses, and that

¹ It is true, as Dr. Driver has urged (*Contemporary Review*, February 1890, pp. 224, 225; *Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament*, pp. 83, 84), that Deuteronomy does not claim to have been written by Moses. But it is claimed that the discourses were delivered by Moses; see *e.g.*, i. 1, v. 1, xxix. 2; cf. vi. 1, vii. 1, xi. 8, 10, 11, 29, xxiii. 20, xxviii. 21, 63. We cannot accept Dr. Driver's argument (*ibid.*) for setting aside this testimony.

'the historical references were to real events and to acknowledged facts in history ; and . . . the prophetic references imply throughout a clear recognition on the part of our blessed Lord of the inspiration of the prophets He referred to, of the reality of their predictive knowledge, and of the distinctness of their Messianic foreshadowings and prophecies' (p. 177).

The book ends with some references to the special forms of the analytical view which have been advocated in the Church of England, including a passage in which it is said :

'An inspiration of the Holy Ghost in writing the history of the past or the present we can understand ; we can realize an inspiration by which the working out of the will of God may be foreseen in the future ; we can believe in an inspiration of reminiscence, and an inspiration of selection, but an inspiration of the idealizing of history, or, in simpler language, of re-painting history, must be pronounced to be, in the case of the great majority of Christian minds, incredible and inconceivable' (pp. 195, 196),

and a statement of critical work which calls for 'research and investigation' :

'The subject of the language in which the different books of the Old Testament are written, . . . the whole question of the text, the notes in the earlier books and the historical books, the marks of compilation in the Pentateuch and in later books, the probability of additions being made from time to time to the ceremonial law, the quotations and references in the historical books, and the consequent relations of the books to each other, the genealogies, early and late, and the principles on which they appear to be constructed, the legitimacy of the inferences which have been drawn from the names of Almighty God, a clear statement of the alleged anachronisms and contradictions,—all these, and others that might be added to the list, are now seriously demanding a far more thorough and systematic investigation than they have yet received at our hands. To such subjects all the best efforts of modern criticism may be safely and helpfully directed. It is on these details that a far fuller knowledge is required before we can hope either to place the principles and conclusions of what we have termed the traditional view on a secure basis of tested facts, or to maintain a strong position against the increasingly aggressive efforts of modern destructive criticism' (pp. 208-10).

The Bishop's arguments may well be left to speak for themselves without further comments on our part. Our feeling in reading his work has throughout been one of deep thankfulness. If we differ from him at all, it is in doubt whether he may not somewhat over-estimate the extent of the revision by late editors of the sacred books. On the main questions we have on several former occasions expressed our

belief.
not lea
can be
that no
satisfac
its sup
made c
lying p
author

1. Na
t
K
2. Ph
t
l
3. Na
c
c
4. N
t
c
5. M

WE
whet
abov
conf
read
infor
port
V
Rev
It w
and

belief. In the present controversy patience and caution are not least required. It will be a long time before the last word can be said on many details. Only we would earnestly plead that no solution of the problems of the Old Testament can be satisfactory which does not begin with a full recognition of its supernatural element, or which is inconsistent with the use made of it by the New Testament writers and with the underlying principles of patristic teaching, or which sets aside the authority of our Lord.

ART. III.—RECENT WORKS ON NATURAL RELIGION.

1. *Natural Religion*. The Giffard Lectures delivered before the University of Glasgow in 1888. By F. MAX MÜLLER, K.M. (London, 1889.)
2. *Physical Religion*. The Giffard Lectures delivered before the University of Glasgow in 1890. By F. MAX MÜLLER, K.M. (London, 1891.)
3. *Natural Religion*. From the *Apologie des Christenthums* of FRANZ HETTINGER, D.D. Edited, with an Introduction on 'Certainty,' by HENRY SEBASTIAN BOWDEN, of the Oratory. (London, 1890.)
4. *Natural Theology*. The Giffard Lectures delivered before the University of Edinburgh in 1891. By Professor Sir G. G. STOKES, Bart., M.P. (London and Edinburgh, 1891.)
5. *Manual of the Science of Religion*. By P. D. CHANTEPIÉ DE LA SAUSSAYE. Translated from the German by BEATRICE S. COLYER-FERGUSON, née Max Müller. (London, 1891.)

WE head our article 'Recent Works on Natural Religion,' but whether we are right in classing under that title all the books above described, or all the matter which they contain, we confess ourselves puzzled to say. We can only assure the reader that they all contain a great amount of interesting information and reflection relating to a subject of vast importance, but which is in great need of stricter definition.

When Butler wrote the words 'Religion, Natural and Revealed,' upon his title-page, no one doubted what he meant. It was agreed that Religion meant intercourse between man and a Supernatural Being. Natural Religion meant that por-

tion of this intercourse which takes place by reason of man's natural powers and the circumstances in which he finds himself as an inhabitant of the world, while Revealed Religion meant that intercourse with the supernatural which takes place, or is supposed to take place, by reason of communications made from God to man in the course of history. Thus the two subjects, however closely connected, could be kept quite distinct. A man might treat of the one without touching the other. He might adhere with enthusiasm to revealed religion and make very little of natural; he might accept natural religion, yet reject and disclaim revealed. But things are much changed. In the first place, it has become a contested question whether religion does indeed imply any intercourse with the supernatural, and many deny that it does, though at the same time refusing to admit that they have no religion. They find it either in a vague sense of the supernatural which does not involve any real intercourse, or else in the feelings which are roused in us by things which we meet in this visible world.

The historical method, which, as Professor Max Müller truly reminds us, is but another name for the method of evolution, often drives out Natural Religion at one end, by leading us to doubt whether there is indeed any religion which does not depend upon historical influences, and expels Revealed Religion at the other by reducing all historical influences which have been exercised upon man's religion to an uniform natural level. Things are tending to a condition in which some will say 'all religion is natural,' and some 'all religion is revealed,' while others will refuse to acknowledge the distinction, and will regard all religion as the result of natural forces acting according to inevitable laws impressed upon man's history by the mysterious source of his being.

What will the Church have to say? She can never surrender her faith in the supreme importance and distinctive character of the Christian revelation. And she will equally hold to that sanctity of nature as the work of God, and of man as His very image, in which the basis of Christianity is laid.

But there is no reason why she should refuse to recognize a history divinely guided in the faiths of the heathen world. M. de la Saussaye expects 'to be contradicted when he declares that religion is the specific and common property of all mankind.'¹ We by no means contradict him, unless he means that religion is possessed by all mankind in equal truth and power; and this cannot be the meaning of his

¹ *Manual of the Science of Religion*, p. 14.

words. What we do maintain is that religion implies belief in a living supernatural agency. 'The psychological analysis,' says the same author in a subsequent passage, 'can never suffice for the solution of the whole problem, for religion is impossible except by a simultaneous working of subjective and objective elements.'¹ The true objective element in all real religion is, to us, the existence and activity of God. M. de la Saussaye seems to lay down as much when he says—

'We cannot even recognize such a dilemma as that a religion arose either from the nature of man or from an act of God. We can neither co-ordinate the two terms nor reject one of them. To us, on the contrary, religion seems to spring from the very essence of man, but under influences and circumstances wherein the activity of God is manifest, even though we cannot determine the form of the conditions under which this activity showed itself.'²

If the activity of God is manifest in the religious history of man it cannot be essential that we should be unable to determine the form and conditions under which this activity showed itself. How, indeed, can it be manifest to us unless we have the power of determining to some extent the form under which it shows itself? This we believe to have, by a peculiar manifestation of God's activity, taken place in Christianity. So much being well understood, we are ready to hear with the utmost attention and interest whatever information upon man's religious history the students of his nature and development have to impart. The Christian religion does not appear before us in the volume of De la Saussaye's work which has been published, but it will be treated in the volume still to come; and we are confident that a fair consideration of its phenomena in comparison with those of other faiths must result in presenting it as the realization of all that other religions have strained after or attempted in vain.

We do not wonder that so illustrious a master in the science of language as Professor Max Müller should have been led to treat of the history of religion. His researches in language have made him intimate with the thoughts of many races from their earliest records to their maturity. How vast the store of information which he must have gathered upon that great theme which has furnished both thought and speech with their most constant and most exciting subject! Even this will not seem to the author himself a sufficient account of the connexion between language and religion; for to him words are

¹ *Manual of the Science of Religion*, p. 31.

² *Ibid.* p. 33

not merely the records of thought; they are thought, and there is no such thing as thought without them. Conceptions which are the material of thought come into existence, according to him, only when the words which express them are found. Therefore he who possesses the language in which religious ideas were expressed has not merely a convenient access to the religious ideas, but is in actual contact with the religion itself in the centre of its meaning and power.

We find the greatest difficulty in understanding the theory of the identity of language and thought. How did language arise with no thought before it? Professor Max Müller replies—

‘You may ask, Cannot a concept exist without a word? Certainly not, though in order to meet every possible objection we may say that no concept can exist without a sign, whether it be a word or anything else. And if it is asked whether the concept exists first and the sign comes afterwards, I should say, No; the two are simultaneous; but in strict logic the sign, being the condition of a concept, may really be said to come first. After a time words may be dropped, and it is then, when we try to remember the old word that gave birth to our concept, that we are led to imagine that concepts come first and words afterwards.’¹

The effort of mind to remember a name which we have forgotten, or to ‘find a word’ to express an idea, is doubtless somewhat different from that which the first coiners of words exert in the process of producing their manufacture; for it is an effort of memory going in search of what is somewhere stored up within. But what is it that sets memory upon its quest? Surely the desire to express something which hovers vaguely within the mind and craves for utterance. And when one hears a happy expression from another the welcome which it receives is, ‘That is what I wanted to say.’ Is not this the feeling which the first use of a word to express a concept must have inspired? We grant that the pleasure which the word when found confers is not merely the pleasure of conveying to others the thought that was within us, but that of making it clear to ourselves. Before the word came it was vague and undefined. The word gives it consistency and sharpness. But to say this is not to grant that the conception only arises with the word, an assertion which seems to us to imply that there is really no conception at all. Professor Max Müller himself seems to shrink from such an extreme when, ‘for the sake of meeting every objection,’ he reduces his principle to the assertion that no concept can exist without a sign. For this ‘sign’ may be only the conception itself as

¹ *Natural Religion*, p. 369.

existing in the mind. The conception of 'a man' exists in the mind in the form of a vague image, now of this individual, now of that, with the accompanying sense that other individuals resemble it. This is the conception itself. But even this must have had something behind it. The streams must have gathered before they flowed into the channel, and the word 'man' named the conception and made it ready for use. The place of words in thought and intercourse seems to us very like that of money in commerce. Value does not start into existence with money; but money is such a convenience that when it has come to be used it at once represents value both to our own minds and in our dealings with one another, and it is only by an effort that we are able to imagine how people got on without it. They must have had some sign of value even before money. But this sign, whatever it was, must have come into use because of a compulsion previously experienced. If it were indeed the case that the word sprang up and produced the concept, the fact would seem obviously miraculous, and finding no possible account of it upon human principles of cause and effect, we should be obliged to resort to the direct action of God. And, indeed, when we consider upon any theory this attainment of language, a mental feat performed among the most primitive peoples, which exceeds in power and in usefulness the greatest inventions of educated intellect, we scarce know how to escape the belief that words are a divine gift. We do not mean that at any given moment after man had come to exist God interposed to endow him with the power of expressive speech, but that, in the words of M. de la Saussaye above quoted, language 'seems to spring from the very essence of man, but under influences and circumstances wherein the activity of God is manifest.'

This parallel between language and religion extends to the treatment which each receives from Professor Max Müller. His absolute identification of words and thought shuts from his observation the vague and unformed, but still real movements of mind in which words, if they have any phenomenal causes at all, must needs originate. And in like manner we find in his pages a rich store of information upon the various embodied forms which religion has taken among mankind, yet little discussion, and that little not of the clearest character, upon the vague but real spiritual impulses which lie behind these forms, and which properly constitute Natural Religion.

His treatment of the question, What is religion? opens,

as we might have expected, with a highly interesting discussion of the etymological meaning of the word. We have no disposition to appeal from the great authority of the author when he derives the word from *relegere*, and regards it as originally expressive of general reverence, without any implication of a divine object to whom reverence is to be paid.¹ It is not denied, however, that after a time religion became among the Romans 'more and more defined as the feeling of awe inspired by thoughts of divine powers.' This is, indeed, an inevitable step, because on the simplest analysis of the feeling of reverence, and on a short experience of the active practice of the duty, the thought of its object presents itself. A feeling without an object, or directed towards an abstract conception instead of a person, is a product of late periods of social development. We should not expect to find it in early times, and if it did exist at such times it was sure speedily to lose its impersonal character. If religion really ever possessed so abstract a meaning we can hardly believe it to express a primitive notion. But if, even as a late but inevitable development, it came to involve, even among the Romans, a reference to divine beings, why should Mr. Max Müller assume that when it is transferred from a Roman to a Christian atmosphere 'we enter on purely dogmatic or self-willed definitions'? If the feeling of reverence in which religion consists inevitably requires belief in some divine person to whom it is to be directed, that belief must be capable of some kind of definition, and what right have we to assume *à priori* that any particular definition of it is self-willed? *Religio* in the Christian use does not, in assuming a definite theology, lose the subjective meaning of reverence and piety, and the same two elements, though perhaps in different proportions, are, by Professor Max Müller's admission, implied in the classical sense of the term likewise.

The author rejects, among many others, Dr. Martineau's definition of religion as 'a belief in an Ever-living God—that is, a Divine Mind and Will ruling the universe and holding moral relations with mankind.' The objection to this is that we should thus leave unexplained those long periods during which the human mind, after many struggles, arrived at last at the abstract and sublime conception of a Divine Mind and Will. We imagine that Dr. Martineau would not refuse the term religion to those periods of struggle. But we conceive that he would by no means consent to apply the epithet abstract to a Mind and Will which rule the universe and hold

¹ *Natural Religion*, p. 37 sqq.

relations with mankind. He would regard this faith as the result of a process which from the first implied conscious relations to the supernatural, but which in process of time has been cleared and purified, becoming thereby not more but less abstract.

The theory ascribed to Cardinal Newman is that conscience is the religious organ of the soul, and the faculty which gives us an immediate knowledge of God.¹ This opinion, Professor Max Müller thinks, 'may be quite true as a matter of personal experience in the nineteenth century, but fails to remove the historical difficulty how, from the earliest times, the human conscience elaborated the idea of the Godhead, and thus, and thus only, made religion possible.' The reader will not fail to note in these words the welcome admission that the idea of the Godhead alone makes religion possible. But it seems to us that there is a good deal of misunderstanding in the conception which here and in other parts of the volume we find of the nature and powers of conscience. In another lecture² we find an instructive dissertation on the subject. Conscience, we there find, is but consciousness applied to our recollection of acts in our lives which infringed the rule of right as taught us by others, or by some unexplained instinct which tells us that we are doing something disapproved by others or dangerous to ourselves. And we are bidden to contrast this simple conception with the representation of conscience as an inward monitor, the voice of God, the highest witness of His existence, and the arbiter of right and wrong—notions which are conceived to be refuted by Pascal's observation that good and evil, truth and falsehood, differ with a few degrees of latitude.

There is, indeed, no doubt that instruction, example, and hereditary impulses give their direction to conscience, which therefore has no right to be called an independent teacher of right and wrong. Nay, we can hardly regard the word conscience as any more than a convenient expression for the inward power by which the accumulated result of certain influences and experiences is brought to bear upon our lives. But if we recognize any force or providence in the world around us which we can discern to be working for righteousness, or if there is any discrimination in the power within us by which we can reject some of the moral teaching which external things or people give us as of inferior quality, and accept other portions as superior, then the way is open for God to speak to us through our conscience, and it may truly

¹ *Natural Religion*, p. 63.

² *Ibid.* p. 177 sqq.

be called His voice. And surely it is not possible for a Theist to watch the operations of conscience and the instruction it receives in life, and fail to recognize in them a Divine impress laid upon history and upon man. Conscience is the voice of God, not because it has an independent utterance in itself, but because it has nothing at all to say without His prompting. It seems to us that some such conception of the moral nature of man is necessary to give a meaning to the definition of religion upon which Professor Max Müller himself finally decides. It is reached by a course of reasoning which we may summarize as follows.¹

In the first place 'our highest aspirations have their roots in the universal soil of sensuous experience.' *Nihil est in fide quod non prius fuerit in sensu.* There is no concept without language; concepts arise from percepts, and all percepts are finite in themselves. But the finite implies the infinite. Limitation or finiteness, in whatever sense we use it, always implies a something beyond. It seems to the author that 'even in our earliest and simplest perceptions we always perceive the finite and the infinite simultaneously.' We can only perceive a square by perceiving at the same time the space beyond the square. What applies to space applies also to time. And closely connected with the infinities in space and time is a third infinite, namely, that of cause. The three infinities have three spheres—nature, man as an object, and man as a subject. The infinite in nature reveals itself to us chiefly through objects such as trees, mountains, and rivers, which we cannot know all round: they have a side of mystery, and therefore a 'theogonic capacity.' The infinite in man as an object reveals itself in the memory of ancestors and great men who, though dead, yet seem to possess a kind of presence still, and in those phenomena to which the term animism has been applied. And in man as a subject the infinite is found when man regards his own self.

'Little as we may suspect it, self-consciousness, or the consciousness of self, has given rise from the earliest times to as rich a mythology as the intuitions of nature and the love of our parents and ancestors. That mythology has really survived longer than any other, for we still live in it and speak of spirit and soul and mind and intellect and genius and many smaller psychological deities as so many independent beings or powers or faculties, just as the Greeks spoke of their Zeus, Apollo, and Athene.'²

We doubt whether this ingenious passage gives a real account of the subjective ground of religion. When man

¹ *Natural Religion*, p. 115 sqq.

² *Ibid.* p. 161.

repro
the p
deiti
natu
the
to se
ours
consi
wom
senti
affect
of th
insuf
worl
when
mora
look
of hi
jectiv
for h
as th
the s
Profe
inform

'in th
deity
they
thoug
self, a
outwa

T
Natu
are n
an in
scien
a pro
God'
divin
stran
origin
symp
exter
wards

represents his own self and its powers to his mind, he assumes the position of an object to himself, and the psychological deities, mind, intellect, and genius, are as objective in their nature and origin as those which come from observation of the power of ancestors. From this, indeed, it is impossible to separate them, for we observe them in others as well as in ourselves. The truly subjective source of religion does not consist in man's reflection upon the constituents of his own wonderful nature, but in the active use of them: not in representing to himself that he has the power of understanding and affection, mind, intellect, and genius, but in the actual exercise of these powers. When in the act of loving man finds himself insufficiently supplied by the objects of love which the visible world includes, and extends his affection to higher existences; when in the act of seeking sympathy for his intellectual and moral conclusions and aspirations man finds himself driven to look for a more divine and eternal companionship than that of his fellow-creatures, we recognize in those wants the subjective source of religion; whereas his attempts to account for his possession of these powers by supposing divine forms as their embodiment or their source is only of a piece with the search after causes in nature and in humanity at large. Professor Max Müller actually acknowledges this when he informs us that

'in the same way as behind the various gods of nature one supreme deity was at last discovered in India, the Brāhmans imagined that they perceived behind these different manifestations of feeling, thought, and will also, a supreme power which they called *Ātma*, or self, and of which these intellectual powers or faculties were but the outward manifestation.'¹

The result is that in Professor Max Müller's account of Natural Religion the religious impulses of mankind, as such, are not taken into account. The creation of religion becomes an intellectual process, and the struggles of feeling and of conscience are regarded only as suggesting to the mind of man a problem of origin and not as in themselves possessing by God's gift a creative power, or as responding to objects divinely provided. And we feel this omission peculiarly strange in Professor Max Müller, since his own account of the original meaning of the term religion dwelt with such evident sympathy upon its subjective character in contrast with the external and theological conceptions of religion which afterwards prevailed.

¹ *Natural Religion*, p. 163.

The definition of religion which Professor Max Müller finally gives as his own is this: *Religion consists in the perception of the infinite under such manifestations as are able to influence the moral character of man.*¹

This definition is an amendment of one which the author had formerly presented, and which described religion simply as 'the perception of the infinite.'² It is so far a real amendment that it recognizes in some degree the practical aspect of a thing which has always been so practical as religion. It seems to us wonderful that anyone, especially Professor Max Müller, should ever have defined religion as consisting of a dry dogmatic perception, without moral power, without emotion, without worship. This is the objection which, as urged by Pfeleiderer, induced Professor Max Müller to alter his formula. But even in its present form the definition seems to be subject to objections which applied to its first state as well as to others of its own.

In the first place, the account of the conditions of human thought which the author has given does not put man in real possession of the infinite at all. That man in his perceptions of space, time, and the sequence of events should always be conscious of a beyond is not to know that there is an infinite. In space we know that beyond the edge of the furthest region to which we extend our thought there must still be space. But it is finite space; for its edge touches the edge of the space of which we think, and is bounded by it. And the same obvious remark applies equally to our perceptions of the time beyond the time we think of, and to the physical causes which lie beyond the extent of physical sequences to which we extend our mental vision. Everywhere the beyond touches, on the side nearest to us, a finite region, and is therefore strictly finite upon this side, though it may stretch indefinitely far on the other. Professor Max Müller seems to us to press his principle, *Nihil in fide quod non prius in sensu*, so far as to render the true perception of the infinite impossible. His infinite is but an infinite finite.

However it be, and whatever the connexion (which we do not at all deny) of thought with sense, we yet do feel ourselves in communion with something which may be called infinite—not because its bounds stretch beyond those of our knowledge, but because the thought of bounds is inapplicable to it at all. We had rather call it the Spiritual than the Infinite. Now that which we feel as matter of our experience cannot have been impossible for man at any time. And the

¹ *Natural Religion*, p. 188.

² *Ibid.* p. 193.

reason
spirit
that
region
up in
spirit
which
affect

B
infini
to in
to m
obscu
called
moral
'that
unite
certai
prom
latitu
deny
when
impur
regar
ciding
must
and t
howe
to us
must
thing
Profes
amoun
which
some

Th
in its
in sup
same
gion a

Alt
acquir
they re
as som

reason why man has always found the infinite in the finite, the spiritual in the material, is not because his senses assure him that there must always be a sensuous region beyond every region of sensuous perception, but because there always springs up in the midst of the things of this world a something spiritual responding to those parts of man's own nature which are above the powers of sense—his emotions, his affections, and his conscience.

But when our author adds to his 'perception of the infinite' the limitation 'under such manifestations as are able to influence the moral character of man,' we doubt his right to make an addition which seems to us both arbitrary and obscure. Surely an immense amount of what has been called religion in the world has been without influence on the moral character of man; M. de la Saussaye declares his belief 'that Religion and Morality, separate in their origin, became united in course of time.'¹ Moreover, we are left in uncertainty whether the morality which 'religion must needs promote in order to deserve its name' is the morality of our latitude or that of some other place or time to which we deny the name of genuine morality altogether. Is religion, when it induces its votaries to include human sacrifices or impure rites among the necessary parts of morality, to be regarded as worthy of its name? If not, do we not, in deciding what kind of morality religion, in order to be religion, must promote, claim that power to apply a divine standard, and to possess the law of righteousness by the voice of God, however heard, which Professor Max Müller refuses to ascribe to us? But if, on the other hand, the influence which religion must exercise on the moral character of man includes everything that ever was deemed morality, the new words which Professor Max Müller adds to his definition become nugatory, amounting merely to this: that a perception of the infinite which is to be called religion must influence human action in some direction or other.

The definition which M. de la Saussaye gives of religion in its widest sense seems to us a better one. It is 'a belief in superhuman powers combined with their worship.'² The same writer also treats very well the connexion between religion and morality.

Although the gods do not owe their origin to moral ideas, they acquire, nevertheless, a high importance for morality. The order they represent is the order in nature and in cult; but it faces man as something which ought to be, as something to which he must

¹ *Manual of the Science of Religion*, p. 50.

² *Ibid.* p. 71.

submit—in fact, as a moral law. . . . In the very thought of a religious duty the connexion between religion and morality is implied. . . . Religious morality has passed through the following three stages : at first, the gods demand a careful observance of rites, and watch over their own rights in the cult as well as in social ordinances, so far as these are of a religious nature. Secondly, the gods require men to observe certain duties towards each other, and watch over all righteous acts. Lastly, they look to motives : they want man to be virtuous from his heart, and they are pleased with the virtues of humility and love.’¹

M. de la Saussaye naturally proceeds to notice the services of the Hebrew prophets in bringing about the latter development. But though ‘in India ritual was for the most part superseded, not by morals, but by philosophical speculations and magic,’ yet the virtues of the heart were by no means unknown among all so-called pagans.

But the connexion of religion and morality has also its dangers, among which we are interested to note some tendencies with which we are acquainted.

‘Asceticism represents what is against nature, as the demand of religious morality, and drives self-discipline to self-annihilation, and independence from the world as a complete negation of it. Ritualistic and nomistic piety cares only for a strict observance of rites and the ceremonial law, and thus leads to a casuistry pernicious to all morality, the results of which may be seen in Talmudic Judaism and Jesuitism. What is called moralism represents morality as being itself piety, and proclaims the honest man as the ideal of all religion. Methodism, on the contrary, which is prominent in Buddhism as well as in Protestant Churches, is so entirely absorbed in the method of reaching blessedness that, in spite of the many exercises which it prescribes, it often neglects true morality.’²

We feel it to be somewhat unfair to Mr. Max Müller to pass over his historical information about heathen religions, which is uniformly interesting and important, and to dwell upon his own philosophy and theology, which seem to us by no means so intelligible or so true. The limits of our space compel us to do so, and we must remember that he himself presents his results not merely as historical collections, but as religious admonitions of ‘what our age wants more than anything else.’

When we regard his work in this didactic character there are certainly some parts of his method with which Catholic Churchmen find themselves in harmony. His exaltation of the worth of history in the study of Natural Religion falls

¹ *Manual of the Science of Religion*, p. 237.

² *Ibid.* p. 239.

in
Relig
not s
own
sion
stage
yes,
thoug
by G
its bo
sectar
reduc
N
tempt
to ha
lips a
natur
of ou
religio
out la
they h
be as
Profes
known
in whi
better
Pr
server
much
the ho
for so
down
can po
mand
sion u
wordle
religio
more s
beautif
woman
bow b
from r
sinkest
the aut

in well with the value which they place on it in Revealed Religion. Their Christianity, like his Natural Religion, is not something to be invented by every individual out of his own prepossessions and his fancied inspirations, but a possession which comes to him from the past, and in which every stage of past religious history has something to tell him—yes, and something to bequeath to him by heredity, even though he does not consciously listen to it. Though it is not, by God's mercy, a bookless religion, yet it existed before its books were given. Whatever may have taken place in sectarian communities, the Catholic Church has never been reduced to a narrow bibliolatriy.

None of our readers will feel tempted to share in that contempt for Natural Religion which Professor Max Müller seems to have come in contact with. The bishops who 'curl their lips and toss their heads when you speak to them of that natural and universal *religion* which existed before the advent of our historical religions—nay, without which all historical religions would have been as impossible' as poetry is without language—are not bishops after our mind. Who can they have been? We should have supposed that they would be as glad as we are to receive from such an authority as Professor Max Müller an assurance that the imperfections of known religions represent a declension from a primitive state in which God was nearer to men and in which they knew Him better.

Professor Max Müller² reproaches various classes of observers with making sometimes too little and sometimes too much of the religion of savages, according to the purpose of the hour. We hardly think him free from the same reproach; for sometimes we find him representing man as so bound down within the circle of sense that nothing supernatural can possibly find its way to him, so absolutely at the command of his words that he will be a slave to forms of expression until he can find a religion not merely bookless but wordless. At other times we find the possessor of a natural religion displayed to us as in contact with the supernatural more simply and effectually than the believer in revelation. A beautiful story is told by Professor Max Müller of a Samoyede woman, who said, 'Every morning I step out of my tent and bow before the sun and say, "When thou risest I too rise from my bed;" and every evening I say, "When thou sinkest down I too sink down to rest."' It may be that the author is right and that this simple faith 'encircled the

¹ *Natural Religion*, p. 570.

² *Ibid.* p. 87.

routine of her daily existence with something of a divine light.' But if it did, what becomes of the maxim *Nihil in fide quod non prius in sensu*? There is no divine light in *sensu*; and if she had such a light she received it through some capacity in herself and by some revelation from above. 'It gave her,' says the author, 'the sense of a Beyond, and that is the true life of all religion.' But, according to the tale itself, she found her guide not beyond the sun, but in it. To say that the true life of all religion is found in the cold negative sense of a something beyond everything that we know is indeed but a poor account of it. The 'true life of religion' can only come from a living source, and a living source is not to be found in the inaccessible Beyond.

The exuberance of the author's mythological learning absolutely leaves us uncertain as to the meaning which he attaches to the title of his book. Are all the religions of which he gives account, with all their mistakes and all their degradations, to be accounted as natural religions? It would seem so from some passages. In the second series of his Giffard Lectures¹ we find him writing, 'We are asked, What can a study of the old and dead religions of the world teach us who are in possession of a new and living religion? What can we learn from Natural Religion who pride ourselves on the possession of a Supernatural Religion?' We here find Natural Religion regarded as another way of naming the old and dead religions of the world. Christianity stands upon one side and the natural religions on the other. Such a meaning of the term would be consistent in a writer who believed without restriction or deduction in the supernatural character of Christianity and the absence of the supernatural in other religions. But this is not Mr. Max Müller's position. His endeavour is to show an uniformity in religions whereby not only the concept of God, but the chief component parts of the moral law are common to them all. On the other hand, there are very large portions of the Christian creed which he does not accept. Is it, then, the *claim* to a supernatural character, even though not justified, which puts Christianity in contrast with natural religion? No, for a similar claim to supernatural origin has been set up by nearly all of those old and dead religions which our author classes under the term natural.

And, indeed, the very next sentences which Professor Max Müller writes display the difficulty under which his method leaves us in replying to the question, What is Natural Religion? For he proceeds—

¹ *Physical Religion*, p. 331.

us th
noth
whic
noth
Him
heav
whole

Here
thing
The
histo
cover

In
autho
Relig
Paul.
God
glorifi
with a
drags
pollut
it and
discip
record
of God
God, y
Natur

Th
prove
idea, h
from th
been a
which
God, di
human
languag

Pro
learning
ligion w
have kn
a servic
facts by
kind to
unknow

VOL.

'What can a study of Natural Religion teach us? Why, it teaches us that religion is natural, is real, is inevitable, is universal. Is that nothing? Is it nothing to know that there is a solid rock upon which all religion, call it natural or supernatural, is founded? Is it nothing to know from the annals of history that God has not left Himself without witness in that He did good and gave us rain from heaven and fruitful seasons, filling our hearts, and the hearts of the whole human race, with food and gladness?'

Here Natural Religion in the first sentence means a different thing from the religion which is natural in the second. The one denotes the mixed and sullied record of the religious history of mankind, and the other the pure gold which is discoverable in the midst of all the dross.

If we could suppose the latter view to represent the author's opinion, it would bring us to a conception of Natural Religion closely resembling that which was taught by St. Paul. He believed that man knows God in nature because God has revealed Himself there. But knowing God he glorified Him not as God, but contaminated His worship with all kinds of degrading additions. And it is Christ who drags forth Natural Religion from the heap of error and pollution under which it was hid, and renews it and restates it and incorporates it with His own teaching. And for His disciples, though it be edifying and instructive to inspect the records of heathen religion, and recognize in them the tokens of God's work upon man, and man's ever-present want of God, yet it is far more hopeful and effectual to seek for Natural Religion in the life and message of Christ.

The records upon which the science of Religion is founded prove to us beyond a doubt that Natural Religion, in its pure idea, has never existed among men. It must be smelted out from the various earthly elements through which alone it has been apprehended by mankind. It is this fact of history which shows the need of Revelation, and gives hope that God, discerning man's incapacity to know Him except through human forms, would give to His children a revelation in that language which alone they can understand.

Professor Max Müller, who expounds to us with so much learning the various earthly forms in which the Natural Religion which he values so highly has presented itself, might have known better than to suppose that he is doing mankind a service by striving to divest it of those earthly forms and facts by which Christianity has made it effective among mankind to a degree which, as he himself admits, is elsewhere unknown.

One would think that if we could depend upon anyone to abstain from the manufacture of fancy religions it would be Professor Max Müller, that determined adherent of the historical school. 'The Science of Religion,' he himself tells us, 'has to deal with facts, not with theories.'¹ And yet he also requires us to believe, as the result of grave inquiry, that 'Dr. Martineau the Unitarian deserves the name of Christian as much as Dr. Liddon.'² Dr. Martineau is a very great and good man. But this comparison is meant to imply that all Catholic religion, except the very attenuated Theism of 'the Seat of Authority,' consists of unnecessary additions to genuine and essential Christianity. In this sense we must decline to accede to the proposition. Dr. Martineau does not deserve the name of Christian as well as Dr. Liddon; for the one held, and the other does not hold, that form of belief which, if history and not theory is to prevail, deserves the name of Christianity.

Professor Max Müller is a teacher after the very heart of the founder of the Giffard Lectures. The vastness of his learning and what we must be allowed to call the indefiniteness of his conclusions are apparently just what Lord Giffard desired. But it is hard to know where such another lecturer could be found. The English race is not prolific in such intellects. We are impatient of unstable equilibrium, and therefore it was certain that, sooner or later, the choice would fall upon a lecturer reluctant to take the position of a collector of data, without drawing stronger conclusions on the one side or the other than the terms of the foundation would seem to expect.

This probability could not be better exemplified than in the contrast which Sir G. G. Stokes's *Natural Theology* offers to the *Natural Religion* of his predecessor. Mr. Max Müller's margins are crowded with references, and his pages teem with accumulated facts. We believe there is not a reference in the other book from beginning to end. It is pure reflection upon common facts open to us all. *Natural Theology* assumes in its pages its ancient and recognized position as a department of the actual religious possessions of mankind—so much of the spiritual equipment of a Christian as belongs to his position as a human being and a dweller in the world. Nay, Sir G. Stokes having in the first four addresses found himself 'very much cramped by the provisions of the will, perhaps too slavishly regarded,' determines in the remainder of the course to adopt a more liberal interpretation of his duty, and to admit the Christian argument.

¹ *Physical Religion*, p. 366.

² *Ibid.* p. 333.

what
patil
grou
taug

lect
by h
calm
impr
faith

I
large
have
base
Thor
we sl
quire
alrea
whor
great
way,
take

F
on 'C
woul
a sho
tends
prima
girdin
mers,
turned
writer
scribe
recom
to pre
mer w
as a fo
predes

Bu
other r
directl
ciples
our na

¹ *Nat*

'The lecturer, it may be observed, is only desired not to *rest* on what he holds to have been revealed, and it does not seem incompatible with this requirement to examine into the *reasonableness*, on grounds of purely natural theology, of what he believes to have been taught to man in a supernatural manner.'¹

We cannot profess to have derived from Sir G. G. Stokes's lectures the same amount of fresh thought which is furnished by his brilliant predecessor in office. But his reflections are calmly and lucidly put, and his scientific position adds an impressive sanction to his restatement of time-honoured faith.

Dr. Hettinger's *Natural Religion* forms a portion of a larger work, the *Apologie des Christenthums*, which appears to have a wide circulation in the Roman Catholic Church. It is based upon the teaching of the schoolmen, especially St. Thomas Aquinas. It certainly has a considerable value, but we should never think of putting it into the hands of an inquirer. It is for professors or students whose minds are already made up, and who expect to deal with people in whom the determination not to doubt clears the ground for a great deal of interesting instruction; a strong position in its way, but it is not everyone in these days that is disposed to take it, least of all in Germany.

Father Bowden, of the Oratory, prefixes an introduction on 'Certainty,' the object of which we do not appreciate. It would seem as if Father Bowden's chief purpose was to have a shot at the Reformers—an extremely petty motive, which tends greatly to lower the tone of the book as a statement of primary truth. Fancy Butler or Paley beginning his work by girding at the Pope. It will be news to many that the Reformers, 'so far from setting free human reason, gagged it and turned it out of court.' But we find it difficult to credit a writer with any great knowledge of the Reformers who describes the sources of divine truth which they severally recommended as 'Luther's appeal to the Bible alone, Calvin's to predestination, Cranmer's to the royal supremacy.'² Cranmer was Erastian enough, but he never sent us to Henry VIII. as a fountain of divine truth any more than Calvin sent us to predestination.

But in fact it is trifling to speak of the Reformation or any other movement, were it Christianity itself, as having originated, directly or indirectly, a new principle of certainty. The principles of certainty are settled for us by the constitution of our nature, and every truth which offers itself to us in any

¹ *Natural Theology*, p. 109.

² Hettinger, Introduction, p. viii.

age must conform to these natural conditions. The sphere in which man's faculties are exercised widens in all directions, spiritual and material, as time proceeds. His stores of knowledge, divine and human, grow, and his faculties strengthen by use. But any attempt to change the natural meaning of the words certainty and truth must fail, and sooner or later react injuriously alike upon the teachers who have taught and on the pupils who have accepted it. There cannot be a greater offence against the cause of truth than to identify the lofty truths of morality and religion which commend themselves to the universal intellect of man with those helps for human weakness which God has sparingly yet sufficiently provided, but which man has extravagantly and unhealthily enlarged. The greatest offenders in this wise are the inventors of the modern Roman doctrine of Infallibility. For here is a doctrine the evidence of which, such as it is, is of a purely contingent character, and which no man is bidden by his reason or his conscience to accept. The being of a God and the divine mission of Jesus Christ appeal directly to reason and conscience; but the infallibility of the Pope must be established by historical arguments of the weakest degree, supported by that fear of doubt and desire for guidance which even when they are innocent and reasonable fall infinitely below the self-evidencing power of the great truths we have named. Such, however, is the papal system that all that is taught as truth must be presented together as equally sure: for what can be surer than infallibility? And men are invited on the same grounds and under the same penalties to accept the faith of God and the legend of the Assumption.

'Though natural religion,' says Mr. Bowden, 'rests upon the surest basis of reason, yet, seeing the difficulty men experience in understanding the force of demonstrative argument, or in recognizing with certainty what is most evidently proved; and seeing further the doubts begotten by the conflicting theories of those who are reputed wise, therefore God has provided for all a safe means of knowing what is needed for salvation.'¹

We believe that God has provided means by which those who cannot understand the force of demonstration may be borne harmless at the judgment seat, and brought through life without disaster. But these means do not consist in providing another infallibility to supply the place of that supreme certainty, at once natural and supernatural, and enjoyed far more often by the simple than by the learned, which is found in

¹ Introduction on 'Certainty,' p. xxxi.

the
exp
dep
give
to g
the

AR
I

1. A

2. M

THE
of H
by th
langu
discus
of the
ably c
depar
the ru
dition
rather
endeav
versy
range.
where
soever
discard
revived
augmen
at som
learned
Glouce
His acc
later O

the communion of the soul with God ; but in those far lower expedients which consist in submission to authority and dependence on His pitiful allowance for our infirmity. To give these their place is prudence, modesty, and good sense ; to give them more than their place is voluntary slavery. But the direct access of the soul to God is Natural Religion.

ART. IV.—DRIVER'S 'INTRODUCTION TO THE LITERATURE OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.'

1. *An Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament.* By S. R. DRIVER, D.D., Regius Professor of Hebrew, and Canon of Christ Church, Oxford, formerly Fellow of New College, Oxford. (Edinburgh, 1891.)
2. *Neue kirchliche Zeitschrift.* I. Jahrgang, Hefte 9, 10. Beiträge zur Entstehungsgeschichte des Pentateuchs. D. KLOSTERMANN. (Erlangen und Leipzig, 1890.)

THE interest in the question of the so-called 'higher criticism' of Holy Scripture continues to increase. Brought to the front by the publication of *Lux Mundi*, it has not been suffered to languish. The appearance of Canon Driver's *Introduction*, the discussion at the Church Congress, and the weighty Charge of the Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol, have very considerably extended the area of the controversy. At first the new departure taken by the younger divines of the Catholic school, the rupture between them and those brought up in the traditions of Dr. Pusey and of the Oxford movement, seemed rather to stupefy than to arouse the public mind. The earnest endeavours of Dr. Liddon and others to prevent the controversy from reaching an acute stage also tended to narrow its range. But the very outspoken utterances at the Congress, where the readers and speakers, to what theological school soever they might belong, seemed almost with one consent to discard the traditional view of Holy Scripture, has not only revived the interest which had been felt, but has considerably augmented it. Much anxiety and alarm has been expressed at some of these utterances, and we can only hope that the learned, spirited, and most effective Charge of the Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol on the traditional side may help to allay it. His account of the reasons which have weighed with men of the later Oxford school in coming to terms with the new criticism

is doubtless in the main correct. Catholic theology has never rested its case wholly on the Bible, as Protestantism has done. A co-ordinate authority has ever been supposed to attach to the voice of the Spirit in the Church; and the Oxford Catholics believe that they are doing service to those who come within the sphere of their influence by surrendering what appear to them to be mere outposts, and concentrating their efforts on the revelation of God in Christ. They have been anxious to point out that if the new criticism should prove to be well grounded, the Christian faith has, in their opinion, nothing to fear. It had been well if they had confined themselves to this. But, unfortunately, they have gone much farther. The doctrine of 'pious illusion' has been coquetted with. It has been regarded as arguable not merely whether Moses wrote the Pentateuch, and whether the Pentateuch is a composite or a homogeneous work, but whether Moses was the author of what has been hitherto known as the Mosaic Law, whether the institutions of Israel as handed down to later times, and as commented upon, for instance, in the Epistle to the Hebrews, were anything but post-exilic inventions, whether the Israelites ever received the Revelation of Jehovah at all, as described in Holy Writ, and whether, in contradiction to the whole received history of Israel, they were not given at first to a polytheistic worship precisely analogous to that of their neighbours.¹ Now, the older school of Tractarians, without committing themselves to anything like Bibliolatry, adhered strictly to the doctrine that the Church was 'the witness and keeper of Holy Writ.' They held that in the sacred volume was contained the deposit of truth which it was the bounden duty of the Church to guard and to interpret, and that any derogation of the supreme authority of the written Word, any confession of error in its essential teaching, would be ultimately fatal to the religion of which it professes to be the record. The course, therefore, of what we may venture to call the neo-Catholic school was, in the eyes of their elder brethren, an extremely hazardous one. But unfortunately this is not all. The necessities of their position drove them into a course still more hazardous—the assertion of the limitation of the human knowledge of our Saviour Jesus Christ. It is not our purpose to discuss this question. On it we must refer our readers to articles in previous numbers of the

¹ This is the belief of Wellhausen and Kuenen. Mr. Cooke at the Congress did not go quite so far, but he said that their religious rites were by no means so different from those of their neighbours as had been supposed.

Church
rate ex
Bishop
ing th
guard
that o
those v
It is c
critici
consid
Liddo
Christ
tion th
Cathol
sweepi
posts,
danger

The
studen
Old T
latest r
or som
the He
the bo
which
ception
pages.
of cour
ference
We are
criticis
Psalter
permitt
induced
contrar
reasons
not mo
are not
notice,
tained
is state
cannot
accusat
delibera

Church Quarterly Review, and to the masterly and elaborate exposition of the Christian doctrine of the Kenosis in Bishop Ellicott's Charge. We content ourselves with echoing the warnings which will there be found against unguarded statements on so solemn a subject. And we would add that on this point we desire to enter into no controversy with those who deny the historical authority of the Old Testament. It is of course possible that their view of Old Testament criticism may be correct. In that case we should have to 'reconsider our position'—to use a phrase of the late Canon Liddon's—in regard not only to the Old Testament but to Christ Himself. All that is meant is simply this: we question the judgment of those whose boast it is that they are Catholic Christians, yet who would make so considerable, so sweeping, a surrender of what are not mere theological outposts, but important and even vital truths, in prospect of dangers which after all may prove to be imaginary.

The object of Canon Driver's work is to provide the student of Holy Scripture with a guide to the contents of the Old Testament, according to what are supposed to be the latest results of scientific criticism. Of the 520 pages, 150, or somewhat more than a third, are devoted to a review of the Hexateuch, and to this, as far the most important part of the book, we shall exclusively devote ourselves in the remarks which follow. The remaining historical books, with the exception of Chronicles, Ezra, and Nehemiah, are treated in 43 pages. Nearly 150 pages are devoted to the Prophets, and of course the doctrine of a second Isaiah is maintained in reference to chapters xl.-lxvi. The Psalms are briefly treated. We are glad to find that Canon Driver rejects the sweeping criticism of Professor Cheyne, which would assign the whole Psalter to a period subsequent to the exile. But we may be permitted to regret that the exigencies of a theory have induced Canon Driver to assign Ps. lxxviii. to that period, contrary to the opinion of critics of note, and without any reasons assigned. The Book of Job is divided into two parts, not more. The extravagances of the extremer school of critics are not adopted. The rest of the book demands no particular notice, save that the pre-exilic composition of Ruth is maintained against Ewald, Wellhausen, and Kuenen, and while it is stated that 'there is certainly much' in Chronicles 'that cannot be strictly historical,' the writer is defended from the accusations of Wellhausen and others of being 'guilty of a deliberate perversion of history.'¹

¹ *Introduction*, p. 501.

It is necessary to observe that the new school of Old Testament criticism is divided into two sections. The one, the more advanced school of Wellhausen and Kuenen, regards the Old Testament as a whole with little favour. As to the Book of Chronicles, no words are too strong to describe its fatuity and its prejudice.¹ Its wholesale inventions to prop up the recently invented doctrines of the 'priestly party' are as morally culpable as they are intellectually absurd. And to these writers the whole law is a later invention. The Jews owed to Moses only the 'original form' of the Ten Commandments.² They worshipped the same gods as the nations of Canaan, and with rites almost precisely similar. It was only in the reigns of the later kings of Judah that the 'priestly party' began to teach monotheistic doctrines, and to found religious ceremonies upon them, and at last to produce a forged document—the so-called Book of Deuteronomy—which they ascribed to Moses, and on which all the remaining provisions of the Jewish law were subsequently grafted.³ It is but fair to Canon Driver to say that he and his English followers advance no such extreme theories as these. They confine themselves to the assertion that the Pentateuch, or as they call it, with the addition of the Book of Joshua, the Hexateuch, is a composite work. It consists of the writings of a Jehovist and of an Elohist narrator, combined, and in some cases so skilfully blended that it is impossible to distinguish the two narratives, by a later hand. These works are assigned to a date from 750–900 B.C., and the Jehovist is by some, the Elohist by others, regarded as the earlier. To these, which Canon Driver calls the 'Prophetical Narrative,' is to be added another which he calls the 'Priestly Narrative.' Its style is 'stereotyped, measured, and prosaic.'⁴ Its date, according to Canon Driver, who here follows Wellhausen and Kuenen, is after the return of the Jews from the Captivity. He gives his reasons, to which we shall hereafter recur. But he is very reticent about the names of those who hold that it is as old as, or older than, the two narratives we have just mentioned. There are 'still scholars,' he says, 'who assign at least the main stock of it to 9–8 cent. B.C.' As a matter of fact *all* the older critics of note,

¹ *Hist. of Israel*, pp. 173–209. Wellhausen declares that 'cunning, treachery, battle, and murder are passed over in silence' by the author of Chronicles 'in a deliberate, and, in its motives, a very transparent mutilation of the original narrative,' and he adds that in Chronicles 'power is the index of piety, with which it rises and falls.'

² Kuenen, *Religion of Israel*, vol. ii. p. 7.

³ Wellhausen, *Hist. of Israel*, p. 9.

⁴ P. 123.

De Wette, Ewald, Knobel, Bleek, Hupfeld, Stähelin, Nöldeke, regard this curt and stereotyped narrative as the 'Grund-schrift,' upon whose dry details the later picturesque narrative was gradually engrafted. And Dillmann, a later critic, on whose sagacity and acumen Canon Driver appears at other times to rely, maintains decidedly the opinion that 'P,' as we shall hereafter call this portion of the books of Moses, is earlier than the rest of the narrative.¹

The learning, diligence, and ingenuity of the German writers by whom the so-called 'higher criticism' of the Old Testament has been elaborated, deserves the highest commendation. But even learning, diligence, and ingenuity are apt to go astray when the question is one of hypothetical reconstruction of documents. It were to be wished that Canon Driver had been able to tell us how the results which he so unreservedly accepts have been arrived at. But this, as he himself tells us,² was an impossibility. By the terms of his agreement he was limited in space; but it is none the less a drawback that those who wish to examine into the question find it extremely difficult to meet with a definite statement of the grounds by which the conclusions of the new criticism are reached. Each writer adopts the conclusions of his predecessor, and reasons are rarely given. It were much to be wished that those who are called scholars in England would carefully go over the ground for themselves, instead of perpetually telling us that 'scholars' have not only 'proved' that different documents have been embodied into the Hexateuch, but are able to distinguish the documents one from another. Even the supposed two accounts of the Creation cannot be demonstrated to have been by different hands, though of course there are grounds for supposing that it may have been so. At all events, there is no conclusive evidence that Gen. i. and Gen. ii. contradict one another.³ Professor Cheyne, it is true, in a recent article,⁴ has informed us that 'the criticism of Genesis,' which he defends against Professor Klostermann, has been practised 'for the last 140 years.' We fear this statement must be taken with a little reserve. That it has been held for as long

¹ Dillmann contends against the opposite view in his Preface to Gen. p. xviii, as well as in his summary of the whole question at the end of his commentary on the Hexateuch. Graf appears to be the only critic of note, beside Wellhausen and Kuenen, who holds Canon Driver's view. It can hardly, in the face of this fact, be argued that 'critics are agreed' as yet on the question of the later origin of the 'Priestly Code.'

² Preface, p. ix.

³ See below, p. 364.

⁴ *Expositor* for August 1891.

a period that there were signs of compilation in Genesis is an undoubted fact. But that this criticism has until a comparatively recent period assumed the form in which it is now confidently presented to the public is incorrect. It is true that Astruc, as far back as the middle of the last century, held that Elohist and Jehovistic documents were used in the compilation of the Book of Genesis.¹ But he appears to have held that the author was Moses. It is tolerably obvious that if Moses were the author, he must, in writing of events long before his time, have used documents or oral tradition in somewhat of a stereotyped form. These he may have embodied as they stood, and, if he were indeed the author, very probably he did so. But there is the widest possible difference between the theory that Moses used documents in the composition of Genesis, and the theory that the whole Hexateuch was drawn up after the exile by the transcription and incorporation of documents, none of which were older than 900 B.C.² As a matter of fact, the history of the growth of the present theory of the Hexateuch is capable of being presented to the public in as definite a shape as the history of the composition of the books of Moses according to the critical school, and on somewhat clearer evidence. The first idea was that the groundwork of Genesis (the theory seems at first to have been confined to this book) was a Jehovistic and an Elohist document, supplemented from other sources. By degrees these other sources came to be indicated. The Elohist document was regarded as the earlier, and portions of it formed a 'Grundschrift' on which the remaining narratives

¹ Astruc appears to have been the first to divide Genesis into sections. But he separates simply those portions in which the name Jehovah and those in which the name Elohim are used. He does not attempt to deal, for instance, with such a verse as Gen. vii. 16, in which *both* names occur. Later writers have, very consistently, assigned each of these to their respective 'sources.' But they have not deigned to explain what caused the redactor to patch a passage from an Elohist source on a Jehovistic passage, or *vice versa*. We say 'or *vice versa*,' for Jehovah and Elohim are interchanged throughout the chapter.

² As a specimen of the arguments by which questions of this kind are decided, we may take Dillmann's reasons for thinking that the Priestly Code was not drawn up till after the kingly period had begun. He cites Gen. xvii. 6, 16, and xxxv. 11, thereby assuming the impossibility of prophecy, and Gen. xxxvi. 31. It is obvious that to detach this last verse from the narrative, and to regard it as a later addition, is not nearly so violent a hypothesis as is involved in the critical theory, while as to the former, it may at least be affirmed that the impossibility of prophecy is not yet demonstrated. Dr. Pusey called attention to this assumption of German critics in his treatise on Daniel.

were
their
men
xxx
xxx
he th
to w
disc
xliv
scri
Dav
pecu
relie
in th
in th
not y
feld,

1
it) is
Comm
p. xi)
2
and J
Knob
'verw
haltb
apply
3
4

De V
and h
the J
Sprac
of the
5

But t
as ma
identi
not in
chapt
Knob
of the
Kriti
the di
recogn
follow
schwe
sie sic
no dis
regar
cially

were engrafted.¹ Then came the work of assigning to these their respective portions. Ewald found 'some ancient elements' in Gen. xi. 29, xv. 2, xxi. 6-32, xxvi. 13-33, xxix.-xxxiii. 15, 'more connectedly and very little changed' in xxxv. 1-4, 6-8, 16-22. Much, moreover, in xxxviii., xl. *sqq.* he thought 'might be derived from this source, especially as to what regards purely Egyptian topics.' But we do not discover the unadulterated original again till xlviii. 7, 22, xlix. 1-28. Then there was a Book of Origins, or Grundschrift, the date of which he thought was about the age of David.² He supports his view by noticing certain linguistic peculiarities, but they are not those on which Canon Driver relies.³ Stähelin, in his *Kritische Untersuchung*, goes further in the direction of fixing the 'Grundschrift,' and Bleek follows in the same direction, but the conclusions of recent criticism are not yet reached. The analysis is carried a step further by Hupfeld,⁴ and Knobel,⁵ who brings it more nearly into the shape

¹ Canon Driver's description of this 'Grundschrift' (or P, as he calls it) is borrowed from Dillmann's preface to the revised edition of Knobel's Commentary. He calls it 'juristisch, pünktlich, formelhaft' (*Vorbem.* p. xi).

² Ewald seems to have given great offence by discarding the Elohist and Jehovist theory, which had held the field since the days of Astruc. Knobel (Commentary, p. 496) not only describes Ewald's theory as a 'verwickeltes und unklares Gewebe,' but complains that it is 'ohne haltbare Gründe hingestellt.' It is possible that these accusations may apply to a good many critics beside Ewald.

³ *Introd.* pp. 123-8.

⁴ *Die Quellen der Genesis*, Berlin, 1853. Hupfeld is the first, except De Wette, and perhaps Ilgen, to see that a second Elohist is required; and he admits that the narrative of this second Elohist follows on that of the Jehovist 'ohne Spur einer Naht,' and 'in derselben Maniere und Sprachweise' (*Quellen*, p. 41). Nöldeke (1869) denies the independence of the second Elohist and the Jehovist.

⁵ Knobel's Commentary appeared a year before that of Hupfeld. But the analytic criticism is carried further by Knobel in some respects, as may be seen by comparing the two. Knobel's is by no means identical with that of Canon Driver, given below (p. 349). Hupfeld does not include Gen. ii. 4* in his 'Urschrift.' He supposes the whole of chapter v. to belong to it. In chapter vi. he only includes vv. 9-22. Knobel in his first edition makes the whole narrative of the Flood a part of the 'Grundschrift,' except chap. vi. 1-3, 5, 8*, 16*, though in his *Kritik des Pentateuch und Josua* (1861) he has advanced considerably in the direction of Canon Driver's outline of P. In fact, these older writers recognized more fully the difficulty of the task than do some of their followers. Hupfeld tells us how 'die Grenzen der beiderseitigen Quellen schwer zu bestimmen sind, weil ihre Fäden so durch einander laufen dass sie sich geradezu verwirrt zu haben scheinen' (*Quellen*, p. 6). Knobel makes no distinction between what is now known as P and the other Elohist, but regards the Jehovist as having used some other ancient writings, especially two of great antiquity (p. xiii). Some of these writings, however,

on which the critics are now said to be agreed. It is not, however, until later still that this agreement can be said to have been reached, and we shall hereafter give some reasons for the belief that the final conclusions of critical science will require yet further revision. But scarcely had critical analysis claimed to have established a 'Grundschrift,' than a total change occurred in the hypothesis concerning its relation to the rest of the Hexateuch. Instead of this dry, unadorned narrative forming the original basis upon which the rest of the historic structure had been raised, it becomes, as we have seen, with Wellhausen, Canon Driver, and a few other scholars, the work of a writer after the return from the Captivity. The whole theory is thus, to a certain extent, a confession of failure. It is based on the undeniable fact that whole passages are to be found in which the word Jehovah is exclusively used, and others in which the word Elohim is exclusively used, and that the use of these names seems to indicate that the author is making use of, and combining, two or more narratives. But the dividing of the Elohist into two, an earlier and a later author, is arbitrary in itself, and was not adopted until it was found that the hypothesis of only one Elohist would not explain the phenomena. A second confession of failure is Canon Driver's admission that the Jehovist and the second Elohist narratives are difficult to separate. For at first the two Elohist portions were assigned to one author. Then the second Elohist was postulated as distinct from the other two. Now it is found difficult to separate him from the Jehovist. That documents may have been, and probably were, used in the composition of Genesis, we repeat, is not denied. What is doubted is that any critic, or set of critics, how learned and able soever, can possibly assign the various portions of the narrative to the respective sources assumed to have been in existence, without risk of mistake. It is also asserted that the alleged agreement among the critics is much exaggerated. We can see how the theory which culminated in the post-exilic P was built up by slow degrees by detaching, with infinite care were Elohist. The second Elohist reappears in Dillmann, who published a revised edition of Knobel's Commentary in 1875. In this some further advances were made in the delimitation of P. But the agreement which is asserted is hardly even yet arrived at. Ewald afterwards described Hupfeld and Knobel's analysis as 'unsatisfactory and perverse' (*Hist. Israel*, p. 64). The necessity for a second Elohist arose from the facts (1) that some portions of the Elohist narrative were not sufficiently dry and formal for a 'Grundschrift,' and (2) that not only does the Jehovist repeat the Elohist narrative with variations, but the Elohist narrative itself contains similar repetitions and variations.

and p
the na
again
that p
the o
result
the th
to the
from a
nerabl
mist'
unexp
recons

¹ W
in Gene
vii. 6, 7
1-17, 23
6, 11^b-1
7-11^a,
xxxi. 18
27-29;
xlvii. 5
12-13.
force of
these in
ment, th
it in th
v. 23^b,
vistic.
v. 22.

In chap
he inclu
10, 13, 1
are giv
passages
of 'phra
can be p
a proces
told us
Code res

² Th
It is qu
been th
Knobel,
sees tha
fully bra
thesis, th
with the
logue of
who was
passage
An oper
must be

and pains, certain brief historical outlines from the rest of the narrative, in such a way as to escape the objection raised against the earlier and less finished Jehovist and Elohist theory, that portions of the one narrative presupposed portions of the other.¹ But, we repeat, the second Elohist theory is the result of the failure of the earlier and more simple form of the theory; while we owe the minute elaboration of its details to the necessity of constructing a hypothetical set of extracts from a document in such a form as to present the least vulnerable front to the objector.² But when your 'Deuteronomist' retires into the background; when your 'Grundschrift' unexpectedly becomes a supplement; when you have to reconstruct your theory in the face of new and formidable

¹ We append Canon Driver's identification of the Priestly Narrative in Genesis. It consists of chapters i. 1-2, 4^a; v. 1-28, 30-32; vi. 9-22; vii. 6, 7-9 (in parts), 11, 13-16^a, 18-21, 24; viii. 1-2^a, 3^b-5, 13^a, 14-19; ix. 1-17, 28-29; x. 1-7, 20, 22-23, 31-32; xi. 10-27, 31-32; xii. 4^b-5; xiii. 6, 11^b-12^a; xvi. 1^a, 3, 15-16; xvii. 19; xix. 29; xxi. 1^b, 2^b-5; xxiii. 1; xxv. 7-11^a, 12-17, 19-20, 26^b; xxvi. 34-35; xxvii. 46-xxviii. 9; xxix. 24-29; xxxi. 18^b; xxxiii. 18^a; xxxiv. 1-2^a, 4, 6, 8-10, 13-18, 20-24, 25 (partly), 27-29; xxxv. 9-13, 15, 22^b-29; xxxvi. 1; xxxvii. 1, 2^a; xli. 46; xlv. 6-27; xlvii. 5-6^a (LXX.), 7-11, 27^a-28; xlviii. 3-6, 7 (?) ; xlix. 1^a, 28^b-33; l. 12-13. We only ask our readers to consider what an overwhelming force of demonstration it would require to establish conclusions such as these in any science but that of Biblical criticism. Dillmann's arrangement, though mainly the same as that of Canon Driver, yet differs from it in the following points: Gen. vii., P, or, as he calls it, A, contains v. 23^b, and omits 7-9 and 18-21. In chap. xxi., 1^b is in his view Jehovistic. In chap. xxvii. he excludes v. 46. In chap. xxx. he includes v. 22. In chap. xxxiv. his arrangement is 1^a, 2^a, 4, 6, 8-10, 15-17, 20-24. In chap. xxxv. we have 9-15 included, except וַיִּבְרַח in v. 9. In chap. xxxvi. he includes (though doubtfully) 2-8, 9^a, 11, 19^a, 29-35^a, 36-43, and perhaps 10, 13, 16-18. In chap. xlvii. he only admits 5^b, 6^a, 27, 28. No reasons are given for or against the inclusion or exclusion of any of these particular passages. They are probably detached from the rest on the ground of 'phraseological varieties.' But phraseological varieties of this sort can be produced to order in the writings of any author whatever, by such a process as this. We think, moreover, that Canon Driver should have told us on the authority of what critic or critics his sketch of the Priestly Code rests.

² This seems particularly the case with such a passage as Gen. v. 29. It is quite impossible, on the critical theory, to account for its having been thrust into the midst of the dry and formal genealogy of P. Yet Knobel, who had a keener critical eye than Hupfeld in matters of detail, sees that it agrees in style and manner with Gen. iv., and therefore carefully brackets it in his analysis of sources. On the traditional hypothesis, the introduction of this verse is intelligible enough. In accordance with the practice of most historians, the writer interrupts his dry catalogue of names with some special details about the naming of the man who was about to play a conspicuous part in his history. But the passage conflicts with the theory of the character of the Grundschrift. An operation of what Professor Green happily calls 'critical surgery' must be performed, and the foreign body removed.

objections; then it becomes a little strange that your post-exilic author, writing avowedly to use the materials he had to hand for the purpose of recommending a moral and religious system of recent origin, should cast away all picturesqueness and vividness of detail, and confine himself to the dullest and driest task of the compiler. It is still more remarkable to find modern criticism capable of assigning, with the most unerring accuracy, even verses and fragments of verses to the author of P, sometimes adding that a verse is 'partly' from his hand, at other times (as in Deut. xx. 1-3) excepting such a phrase as 'and unawares,' or (as in ver. 6^a) indicating that the citation ends before the words 'and judgment.' One wonders how far the facts are responsible for the theory, and how far the theory is responsible for the alleged facts. There is no doubt a formidable list of linguistic peculiarities¹ put down to the credit of P. But it would be interesting to know how far the assignment of certain passages to this author is owing to the occurrence of the words supposed to be characteristic of him in the portions of the narrative in which they occur;² that is to say, how far the facts have been manipulated to suit the theory. Its very minuteness and elaboration is itself a strong presumption against it.³ One is reminded of those endless epicycles by which Hipparchus strove to account for the failure of the heavenly bodies to comply with the rules laid down for them by astronomers. Unfortunately, we cannot confront these fine-spun theories of critics with contemporaneous facts. We can only compare them with that ingenious cryptogram by which Mr. Donnelly discovered the philosophy of Bacon in the plays of Shake-

¹ *Int.* pp. 123-8. Principal Cave, in his article in the *Contemporary Review* for December 1891, remarks, in regard to this apparently formidable list, that of fifty-seven instances of linguistic peculiarity, eleven are irrelevant, twenty relate to words confessedly not peculiar to P, ten cases relate to a word which does not occur elsewhere, and two to a word which only occurs twice. We must confess that we do not understand to what words Principal Cave refers in his last two classes. But we may remark that it is curious that in the 'stereotyped, measured, and prosaic' pages of P should occur a word (וַיִּי) which is elsewhere found only in poetry.

² See below, p. 354.

³ Dillman admits the difficulty of the task. It is 'eine verwickeltere als man sich früher gedacht hat,' and therefore 'ihre verschiedene Bestandtheile sind gesondert zu behandeln' (*Numb., Deut. and Josh.* p. 634). Wellhausen (*Hist. Israel*, p. 9) admits that P has been 'successful with its tabernacle, its wandering camp, and other archaic details, in concealing the date of its composition.' His language, it must be confessed, is more applicable to a successful forgery than to a tradition of substantial accuracy. We have no definite information from Canon Driver—and it is a somewhat serious omission in an introduction to the study of the Old Testament—whether it is the one or the other. See below, p. 366.

speare
Mr. D
impos
fascina
their c
guilty

It
critics,
largely
their c
scienti
in 'an
univers
tion.'²
regard
tive sc
facts.
of obs
process
to phe
served
laws as
resort
unknow
of mat
before
judge
true th
which
some b
compel

¹ An
linguisti
higher c
belong t
that 'th
criteria,
its comp
which th
may be
satisfact
same tim
accuracy

² *Int.*
³ W
⁴ Ca
facts' or
are not

speare. It is as impossible to refute them as it is to refute Mr. Donnelly. But it will ultimately, we believe, be found as impossible to induce any to accept them but those who are fascinated by their ingenuity, or those who are afraid that their character for scholarship will be lost if they are found guilty of orthodoxy.¹

It seems then at least probable that the agreement of the critics, on which so much stress has been laid, arises very largely after all from the necessities imposed on them by their own theories. We proceed to inquire into the alleged scientific character of the methods employed. They consist in 'an application of the canons of evidence and probability universally employed in historical and literary investigation.'² We will examine this statement. First of all, in regard to the scientific nature of the investigation. Inductive science has always been careful first of all to establish facts. These facts having been established, it became the task of observers to deduce laws from them. Then, reversing the process, the laws were themselves tested by applying them to phenomena, and if their results corresponded with observed facts, then, and only then, was the correctness of the laws assumed to be demonstrated.³ There was no attempt to resort to authority. 'Men of science are agreed' is a formula unknown to the scientific investigator. The demonstrations of mathematics and other branches of science are placed before the student, and he is permitted, nay required, to judge for himself whether they are conclusive or not. It is true that in view of the number and variety of the facts from which inferences are drawn the compilers of handbooks in some branches of science are compelled, or fancy themselves compelled, to adduce authorities in the place of facts.⁴ But

¹ An additional confession of failure may be found in the supposed linguistic peculiarities which have been made the basis of so much of the higher criticism. They originally, as we have seen, were supposed to belong to the 'Grundschrift.' But Canon Driver confesses (*Int.* p. 128) that 'the earlier criticism of the Pent. was mostly literary; and literary criteria, though they enable us to effect the analysis of a document into its component parts, do not always afford decisive evidence of the date to which the component parts are severally to be assigned.' Non-experts may be pardoned for expressing some surprise that a criticism which can satisfactorily analyse a document into its component parts should at the same time be unable to fix their relative dates with a nearer approach to accuracy than 450 years.

² *Int.*, Preface, p. xvi.

³ Whewell, *History of the Inductive Sciences*, ii. 290.

⁴ Canon Driver gives this as his reason for not 'enumerating the facts' on which 'a given conclusion depends' (*Int.* Preface, p. xi). We are not quite sure how far 'grounds not fully stated, but which have

this is deplored by the best teachers of science, and is only resorted to when time or intellectual incapacity prevents the student from himself following up the researches of others. How far is this method pursued in the present instance? Of anything like rigorous demonstration there is absolutely none. But, on the other hand, there is a constant tendency to ignore antagonists. Thus Ewald, while he gently complains of the unsatisfactoriness and perversity of men like Knobel and Hupfeld, disdains to deal with inferior beings, such as Hengstenberg, Delitzsch, Keil, and Kurtz, whom he dismisses as 'below and outside all science.'¹ So Stähelin, while giving a selection of passages supposed to form the 'Grundschrift' or Priestly Code, differing in some degree from that supposed in these days to be established, appeals to other writers as 'almost universally' agreeing to his proposition. And so we are referred from one critic to another, each laying down dogmatically his own system, and seldom, if ever, condescending to state the grounds on which he has adopted it. Thus the basis on which the hypothesis is raised is not demonstration, but authority. That there has been of late a considerable concurrence of opinion in regard to P is no doubt a fact, and it of course deserves serious consideration.² But large deductions must

satisfied the author, can be accepted in evidence. And although it would be doubtless 'tedious' to enumerate those grounds, and impossible in a work like Canon Driver's, yet they ought to be somewhere distinctly stated by some one, and objections to them fully and fairly met. Professor Kirkpatrick in his course of lectures entitled *The Divine Library of the Old Testament* accepts the conclusions of scholars, who, as he cautiously expresses himself, are 'fairly unanimous' (p. 46) on the point. But the plan of his lectures does not permit him to enter into detail. We have elsewhere given reasons for hesitating to pronounce the accounts of Creation and the Flood to be necessarily 'duplicate.' And it would be a great advantage if a Hebrew scholar like Professor Kirkpatrick would go over the ground for us once more, and carefully point out how far the supposed 'peculiarities of language and conception' are clearly matter of fact, and not the result of ingenious manipulations of the material before us. These reasons would be far more cogent if it were not for the entirely arbitrary separation of verses and fragments of verses from the context in which they stand. No rational explanation, e.g., can be given for such insertions as Gen. xxxi. 18^b and xxxii. 18^b in the midst of a separate narrative, save that it is necessary in the interests of a theory. See also how the narrative in Gen. xxxiv. is treated in Canon Driver's analysis of Genesis, already given (p. 349).

¹ *Hist. Israel*, i. 64.

² Canon Driver complains (*Int.* Preface, p. xii) that in certain periodical literature, which he does not name, the discordance of the critics is much exaggerated, and is extended to every point. This, he says, is far from being the case. We have not met with any statements of this kind. The argument from general consent in favour of the composition and contents of P could hardly have been used unless on that particular

be m
which
ance
autho
Nor i
fined
that
Drive
are cl
as reg
opinio
allowe
Green
Drive
hold
being
are 'c
whom
with r
to att
so ab
has al
that i
be ter
withou

point the
we have
ment ha
without
presuppo
those wh
Grundsch
criticism
other. V
the Eliz
But Dill
der Spra
Königzei
Giesebre
while Di
at least 3

¹ *Int.*

² *Int.*

to what i
³ We
to the n
Lectures
has exten
entitled t

VOL.

be made from the weight of this general consent, for reasons which have already been stated. And however much importance we may be disposed to attach to it, concurrence of authority is not the same thing as scientific demonstration. Nor is this all. There is a tendency, not by any means confined to Ewald, to ignore the weight of all testimony except that which is in favour of the hypothesis. Thus Canon Driver tell us that 'there is a large area on which the data are clear, and critics are agreed.'¹ And again, 'In Genesis, as regards the limits of P, there is practically no difference of opinion amongst critics.' What critics? We are afterwards allowed to discover that Keil, Principal Cave, Professors Green and Bissell, and Dr. Kay are *not* agreed with Canon Driver upon the point.² Many other sound Hebraists who hold the traditional view are passed over, we presume as being 'below and outside all science.'³ In other words, those are 'critics' with whom Canon Driver is agreed. Those with whom he is not agreed have no claim to the title. Again, with regard to Canon Driver's own method. We are bound to attach weight to the opinion of so profound a scholar and so able a man. When he tells us that he 'must own that he has always risen from the study of J E with the conviction that it *is* composite,' or that he has never 'adopted what may be termed a critical as opposed to a conservative position without weighing fully the arguments in favour of the latter,

point there had been some concurrence of opinion among critics, though we have already given reasons for the belief that the extent of this agreement has been much exaggerated. But it has been stated, and not without reason, that *on the question of the relative date of the documents presupposed*, there is the widest divergence of opinion on the part of those who are partially agreed at least as to the portions which form the *Grundschrift* or Priestly Code. And yet this is a point on which linguistic criticism ought to be able to arrive at conclusions more readily than any other. We should not ascribe a passage from Ruskin or Tennyson to the Elizabethan age, nor one of Shakespeare or Hooker to our own. But Dillmann (*Num., Deut. und Jos.* p. 663) says of P, 'ihr Abstand von der Sprache der Dichter, Redner und Geschichtschreiber der mittleren Königszeit, auch der des Deut. ist unläugbar.' Wellhausen, Kuenen, Giesebrecht, Canon Driver, and others nevertheless deny it; or at least while Dillmann regards it as 150 years older than J E, they regard it as at least 300 years later.

¹ *Int.* Preface, p. xii.

² *Int.* p. 109. Principal Cave has announced himself to be a *convert* to what is known as the 'Journal Theory.'

³ We have never heard that any one has even condescended to reply to the many cogent arguments advanced in Mr. Watson's *Hulsean Lectures* for 1882 ('The Law and the Prophets'), though his reputation has extended beyond his native land. In Germany, of course, no one is entitled to a hearing if he belongs to the traditional school.

and satisfying himself that they are untenable,' we are bound to give respectful attention to his assertion.¹ But that assertion, backed by the assertion of twenty other learned and competent men, would not, even if uncontradicted, amount to scientific demonstration. Still less can it do so when energetically combated by men who at least have some title to our respect.² We must therefore protest once more against the assertion so persistently repeated that 'scholars have proved' this or that concerning the Hexateuch. The most they can pretend to do is to have made their theory probable.³

¹ It is of course impossible within the limits of a single article to follow Canon Driver through his learned and laborious investigation of the phraseology of the Hexateuch. But we have already intimated a suspicion that the supposed facts may be the offspring of the theory, rather than that the theory is based on plain and patent facts. One or two instances must suffice. Why are Gen. x. 8-19, 24-30, and xxv. 1-6 assigned to J E? Why is not Gen. iv. 18 detached from the rest of the chapter, as is done in so many other instances? Are they not 'stereotyped, measured, and prosaic' enough to keep company with Gen. v.? Are not the marked characteristics of J E, as displayed (see *Int.* p. 13) in iv. 16-26 (with the exception of verse 18), and v. 29 (arbitrarily separated by the critics from the rest of that chapter), conspicuous by their absence in these sections? Can the reason possibly be because ילד occurs in them in the Kal, whereas the Kal of that verb has been noted as a characteristic of J E, the Hiphil of P? Surely, too, a 'foreign element' must be discovered in P in Gen. xlvii. 6-27, for the expressions 'bare,' 'was born' (Niphal) here replace the Hiphil הוליד, as in Gen. iv. 18, which is *not* assigned to P (see *Int.* p. 13). Can it be, moreover, that in Gen. x. the last two verses have been arbitrarily separated from the rest, simply because למשפחותיהם occurs in them, and this has been regarded as a characteristic of P? It is difficult to understand how, unless the redactor were himself the writer of P, so many detached passages from the latter should be imbedded, without apparent reason, in the narrative of J E. Yet the critics are not, so far as we know, agreed that P was the redactor. It is incredible, moreover, that the redactor in Gen. x. 31-32 should have introduced from P a passage to supplement the genealogy of J E when an exactly similar genealogy must have occurred in P, which he would naturally have followed in preference if he intended to conclude with P's words. The passage in P *must* have been exactly similar, or 'these' would *not* have been 'the families of the sons of Noah.' It is remarkable, too, that whereas מין is 'universally admitted' to be a characteristic of P, משפחה and *not* מין is used for *species* in Gen. viii. 19. Must we not recognize a 'foreign element' in P here as in hosts of other cases? This line of inquiry is well worth pursuing.

² Canon Driver is certainly going too far when he says that 'it cannot be doubted that the same conclusions, upon any neutral field of investigation, would have been accepted without hesitation by all conversant with the subject: they are only opposed in the present instance because they are supposed to conflict with the requirements of the Christian faith' (*Int.* p. xiv). It would be equally fair to say 'the composite authorship of the Hexateuch is rejected without hesitation by all conversant with the subject: the only ground on which it is maintained is the assumption that miracles and prophecy are impossible.'

³ Perhaps some of the offence which Professor Klostermann has

lower
omit
to gi
docu
the l
been
have
them
has b
critic
E in
which
gious
respe
as the
been
sacrifi
800 a
doctri
theori
given
Kautz
Quellen
as thou
they ha
Kloster
nicht, c
impelle
brauchi
die ihre
doch je
(Neue k
P
admitti
conside
in the e
He add
was con
belief)
may be
into can
us, more
had bee
now gen
by one m
wards m
It is obv
'Quixoti
and Eloi
portions

Again, Canon Driver tells us that the method he has followed is 'universally employed' in literary investigation. He omits to give instances. But it would be difficult, we think, to give a single instance of the successful reconstruction of documents on grounds of pure criticism. Take the case of the Homeric poems. They have been largely held to have been composed at various times, and by various persons. But have 'the critics agreed' to assign each particular portion of them to its respective author? Their composite character has been, we believe, universally admitted. But even German criticism has ultimately declined to discover a P, a J, or an E in their contents, and to fix authoritatively the date at which such various portions were written.¹ The Hindoo religious writings are usually assigned to various dates. But the respective antiquity of each of them is assigned to them as they stand. Thus the Vedic hymns are supposed to have been written between 1500 and 1000 B.C. The Brahmanic or sacrificial writings have been assigned to the period between 800 and 500 B.C. The Upanishad, or system of mystical doctrine, is ascribed to the fifth century B.C. But no critical theories seem to have been invented which, from internal

given may be due to his calling attention to this fact. Professors Kautzsch and Socin, in their 'Genesis, mit äusserer Unterscheidung der Quellschriften,' have discriminated between P, J E, J' and J' and R as though the whole thing were as plain as the sun at noonday. But they have vouchsafed no proof whatever of their assertions. Professor Klostermann thereupon very naturally remarks: 'Ich zweifle natürlich nicht, dass für ihre Zuhörer ihr Buch ein treffliches und brauchbares *impelle* zu beständigem Aufpassen ist. Für uns andere ist es aber nicht brauchbar, weil es uns bei auffallenden Stellen *die Gründe nicht mittheilt*, die ihre Quellscheidung oder ihre Uebersetzung bestimmt haben, und doch jede Anzweiflung der Begründung aufs energischste verbietet' (*Neue kirchliche Zeitschrift*, i. pt. x. p. 728).

¹ Professor Jebb, in his *Introduction to the Iliad and Odyssey*, while admitting that there are traces of composite authorship in these poems, considers that 'the attempt to define the partnership of different hands in the enlargement . . . can have, at best, only a very indecisive result.' He adds: 'As to the original "rhapsodies" or cantos in which the poem was composed, every attempt to determine their precise limits is (in my belief) foredoomed to failure. In some particular instances the result may be accurate, or nearly so. But a complete dissection of the *Iliad* into cantos must always be largely guess-work' (pp. 170, 171). He tells us, moreover, that while Lachmann's view of the *Nibelungenlied* was that it had been put together about 1210 A.D. from twenty old ballads, 'the view now generally received is that of Professor K. Bartsch, that it was written by one man about 1140,' but that there were two different recensions afterwards made in which assonances were converted into rhymes (*ibid.* p. 134). It is obvious that this tends rather to confirm Professor Klostermann's 'Quixotic' view that not Jehovistic and Elohist *histories*, but Jehovistic and Elohist *manuscripts*, are the source of the Jehovistic and Elohist portions of Genesis.

evidence alone, divide the Vedic hymns themselves into various portions, some of which are of later date than the latest of the mystic doctrines.

We come next to historic investigation, and the canons 'universally employed' in it. And if the method adopted in Canon Driver's treatment of Numbers xvi. were applied to the facts of history, we should be compelled to reject the accounts of events which are occurring under our own eyes. Let us see how the narrative of Korah, Dathan, and Abiram is dealt with. It is a very fair specimen of the 'higher criticism,' and will serve admirably as a test of its soundness. In J E, Canon Driver tells us, we have 'Dathan and Abiram, Reubenites, giving vent to their dissatisfaction with Moses . . . resenting the authority and judgeship possessed by him.' In P, Korah 'opposes Moses and Aaron in the interests of the community at large, protesting against the limitation of priestly rights to the tribe of Levi, on the ground that "all the congregation are holy."' And this is supposed to prove that the account is taken from two different sources. In other words, a political coalition is an historic impossibility. If in the pages, say, of Mr. Froude, we find an account of political events in which a national party is described as pressing on the divorce of Henry VIII. from political motives alone, while another party is engaged in support of the same measure from a desire to see ecclesiastical reforms introduced, we are entitled to say that 'here two, *if not three*,¹ narratives are combined,' some of them, we must not forget, separated from one another by an interval of nearly four hundred years. If, in the vivid pages of Lord Macaulay, we find the account of a coalition against the government of William III. between two parties, the discontented Whigs and the Tories, entirely distinct and even opposed in their principles and aims, the latter complaining of the Whiggish tendencies of the king, the former inveighing against the favour he showed to the Tories, we must see in it two separate and irreconcilable narratives unhistorically blended; and one of them, we fear, if the parallel holds throughout, must be assigned to a period which has not yet arrived. Nay, we must dismiss the history of our own times in like manner as incredible. For do we not read at the present moment of *two* coalitions, the one between Conservatives and Liberal

¹ The italics are ours. For Canon Driver has to resort to another epicycle here. 'In P there appear to be two strata of narrative.' It is true that he further states that the phraseology of the distinct portions is that of J E, and P respectively. But, as usual, we have no proof of the statement.

Unio
strong
party
again
of the
comp
Drive
suspe
our da
Unio
repres
afterw
' retire
Glad
next g
namel
expect
entitle
land a
in the
inter
other.
histori
results

We
extrao
cism w
of Pro
tive of
the fal
don,²
endeav
various
take th
is deal
of the
Testam
strictly
except

¹ Th

² Lay
ing disq
have den
ticular p
cases wh
to us.

Unionists, the other between Gladstonians, most of them strongly opposed to priestly authority, and the Irish priestly party? We find the followers of Mr. Gladstone protesting against the secession of the Liberal Unionists from the ranks of the Liberal majority, and the Irish Roman Catholic party complaining of the tyranny of Mr. Balfour. Now, in Canon Driver's pages we are supplied with some excellent reasons for suspecting the 'composite character' of the intelligence in our daily newspapers. For whereas Conservatives and Liberal Unionists, Gladstonians and Irish Roman Catholics, 'are represented as taking part in a common conspiracy, they afterwards continually act separately.' They occasionally 'retire to their tents at a distance from one another,' and the Gladstonian party at least predicts a 'different fate' at the next general election for their Liberal Unionist antagonists—namely, total annihilation at the polls—from that which they expect to befall their Conservative opponents. Are we not entitled to conclude from this that political sections in England at the present day are 'united, not in reality, but *only in the narrative*,'¹ and that because 'they represent different interests,' and each 'acts throughout independently' of the other. If these are the canons 'universally employed in historical investigation,' we may look for some remarkable results when they come to be more freely used.

We might extend indefinitely our illustrations of the extraordinary conclusions to which this sort of historic criticism would lead. We might contrast its principles with those of Professor Freeman, who, though he may reject the narrative of the false Ingulf as spurious, and may criticize severely the fables of Geoffrey of Monmouth and Henry of Huntingdon,² never dreams of dissecting their narratives, and of endeavouring to fix approximately the date at which their various portions 'assumed their present shape.' But we may take the way in which the narrative of the altar Ed in Joshua is dealt with as a very fair illustration of the trustworthiness of the historic methods employed in the criticism of the Old Testament. 'The place of sacrifice,' we are told, 'is in P strictly limited; and severe penalties are imposed on any except priests who presume to officiate at the altar.' But

¹ The italics are Canon Driver's.

² Lappenberg, in p. xlix of his *Literary Introduction*, gives an interesting disquisition on the sources from which Henry of Huntingdon may have derived his history. But he does not attempt to assign any particular portion of his history to any of those sources, except, of course, in cases where the works from which he has borrowed have come down to us.

'the pre-exilic period shows no indications of the legislation of P as being in operation.' The story of the indignation of Israel at the setting up of an altar beyond Jordan certainly seems at first sight to conflict with this statement. Accordingly Wellhausen deals with the story in very summary fashion. It is an invention of the priestly party to bolster up the claims they have advanced to exclusive privileges. Canon Driver, in common with other English critics who have taken his view of P, does not go so far as this. Nevertheless, the way in which he deals with it is instructive:

'Vv. 7-8 are a fragment of uncertain origin, attached, as it would seem, to v. 6 by a later hand. The source of vv. 9-34 is also uncertain. The phraseology is in the main that of P (cf. the citations, p. 123 ff),¹ but the narrative does not display throughout the characteristic style of P, and in some parts of it² there occur expressions which are not those of P. Either a narrative of P has been combined with elements from another source³ in a manner which makes it difficult to effect a satisfactory analysis, or the whole is the work of a distinct writer, whose phraseology is in part that of P, but not entirely.'

Now, without inviting further attention to the 'verwickeltes und unklares Gewebe' to which we are here introduced, we may venture to ask, why is this passage 'a fragment by a later hand'? Simply because, if it be not, it is fatal to the whole theory of the post-exilic origin of P. And, therefore, just as in the way in which the new criticism is wont to deal with the distinct mention of a 'book of the Law of the Lord' which was in the hands of Joshua, so here. The passage is assigned to a later date, not because of its style, nor of its intrinsic improbability, nor of its obvious inaccuracy, but because the 'Priestly Narrative' theory demands it. The style, it is admitted, is not altogether that of P. There is little evidence in this animated narrative of the presence of the 'stereotyped, measured, and prosaic' style of the priestly narrator.⁴ There-

¹ 'Which, however, do not include all the marks of P's style which the section contains.'

² 'Esp. vv. 22-9, and in the expression *מִן־הַיַּרְדֵּן* vv. 7, 9, 10, 11, 13, 15, 21, which, though common in D¹ and D² (e.g. 1, 12), occurs, in lieu of P's regular term *מִן־הַיַּרְדֵּן*, only in two doubtful passages of P (13, 29^a, Nu 32, 33).'

³ 'The sense of 11^b is uncertain. If the rendering of RV be correct, one chief reason for treating the narrative as composite—viz. that the altar is represented in v. 10 as on the west side of Jordan, and in v. 11 on its east side—disappears.'

⁴ Witness the vehement appeal, twice repeated, to El Elohim Jehovah (and observe the peculiar inversion of the phrase). Witness the energetic language in which the incidents of the past history of

fore,
ask o
this:
becau
must
make
inven
syste
Canoe
word
becau
syste
precis
so in
concl
ture
the di
mirac
critici
invest

W
not ca
occasi
find C
quotes
plying
Can h
(הִירֹן)
of Jor
7, or t
(הִירֹן)
We de
questi
lessnes
of a qu
decisiv
in the
of asse
E. is a
pears t

Israel a
this be
to expla
languag
1 In

fore, it is not assigned to P on linguistic grounds. And if we ask on what grounds it is thus assigned, the answer is simply this: 'The critics are agreed' that P is post-exilic. And because this 'fragment,' if genuine, overthrows that theory, it must be post-exilic also. But we have a further remark to make. If this narrative be not genuine, it is a deliberate invention of the priestly party in support of the religious system they desired to impose on the Jewish people. On Canon Driver's theory there is not—there could not be—a word of truth in it. It could not be a pre-exilic tradition, because there are 'no indications' of the existence of any such system in pre-exilic times. That is to say, his position here is precisely that of Wellhausen, only he either shrinks from saying so in plain words, or he fails to draw the only legitimate conclusion from his premisses. There are few men, we venture to say, of independent judgment, neither fascinated by the disintegration method, nor dominated by a distrust of the miraculous, who would hesitate to set down this kind of criticism as hazardous conjecture rather than as intelligent investigation.

We should not be doing justice to our subject if we did not call attention to the remarkable recklessness of statement occasionally found in the higher criticism. Thus when we find Canon Driver, referring to the phrase 'beyond Jordan,' quotes Deut. i. 1, 5, iii. 8, iv. 41, and Joshua ix. 10, as implying that 'the author was resident in Western Palestine.'¹ Can he possibly be ignorant of the fact that the same phrase (בְּעֵבֶר הַיַּרְדֵּן) is used in Deut. iii. 20, xi. 30, for the *western* side of Jordan, and similarly in Josh. v. 1, ix. 1, xii. 7 (cf. v. 1), xxii. 7, or that in Numb. xxxii. 19 a phrase almost precisely similar (מֵעֵבֶר הַיַּרְדֵּן) is used for *both* sides of Jordan in the same verse? We do not pretend that this fact is decisive either way on the question of authorship, but it at least shows either great carelessness or a rooted determination to look at only one side of a question, when the passages mentioned above are cited as decisive without the slightest hint that there is any difficulty in the matter. Another instance of the unwarrantable freedom of assertion of the critics may be found in the statement that E. is a document of Northern Israel. This statement appears to rest upon two facts, first, that the writer is familiar

Israel are employed to bring the offenders to a sense of their guilt. If this be real history, the story is intelligible enough. It is for the critics to explain how this invention of the priestly party came to be put into language so vigorous and spirited as we find here.

¹ *Int.*, p. 79.

with the geography of Northern Israel, and next that he¹ lays particular stress on Northern Israelite history. Hebron, we are told, 'is subordinate in the history.' 'Reuben, not Judah (as in J.), takes the lead in the history of Joseph. Joshua, the Ephraimite hero, is already prominent before the death of Moses.'² We recommend this passage to the consideration of future historians. Its method will supply them with a good deal of interesting matter. Thus if we read of the victor at Argam and Assaye we shall have reason to conclude that the original author was an Irishman; if of Marlborough's behaviour at the skirmish at Walcourt, we owe the account to some one who was born in the same county as Marlborough. And we presume that if two persons are ever described in history as interesting themselves in the fate of a condemned criminal, historians will henceforth be forced to discover two 'sources' from which the account has been compiled. But the true origin of this 'document of Northern Israel' theory is the difficulty presented by the blessings of Jacob and Moses. Dillmann and Wellhausen regard one or both of them to be the work of a Northern Israelite, on account of the prominence given in them to the tribe of Joseph.³ Of course they were not prophecies—that is quite out of the question. Therefore they must have been extracted from a document in which a patriotic inhabitant of Northern Israel celebrates the greatness of his portion of the confederacy. It does not seem to have been observed, however, that we are thus involved in a new difficulty. How, on this theory, did a Jewish writer, whose work was composed after the apostasy of the Ten Tribes, come to embody the history and the praises of what had now become a separate nation? Canon Driver, it is true, has not adopted this view of the two blessings. But it is equally difficult for him to explain why the glories of 'Ephraimite heroes' or the historic value of Northern Israelite localities should be introduced into his history and dwelt on with pride by a member of a hostile race.

It would, however, be unfair to deny that Canon Driver does bring forward some arguments for the later origin of the 'Priestly Narrative' which must be allowed considerable

¹ We must remember that it is by no means proved that 'he' has any historical existence. We may also add that no such indications of Northern Israelite authorship are discovered here as are pointed out in *Int.* p. 178, as found in the Elisha narratives.

² *Int.*, p. 115.

³ Canon Driver assigns the former to J., and comes to no conclusion about the latter.

weight,
the his
provisi
we rem
the dea
land re
order.
the ecc
accessi
law in a
and Ph
But the
existen
And we
Second
the disc
the incu
Christ, v
Luther,
were no
their bei

To d
Driver's
volume.
further p
been esta

¹ We
to record
have proc
not before
times rath

² It is
between 1
which cann
to attenuat
they may t
of the Pent
have of lat
and there n
portions of
But they ar
core of the
from such
refers simp
built, or to
Josh. viii. 3
the improb
diction betw
would have

weight. Among these the chief is the fact that we find in the history no traces of the observance of some of its chief provisions. But this argument loses much of its force when we remember that the history tells us how, immediately after the death of Joshua and the 'elders who over-lived' him, the land relapsed into idolatry, and consequent distress and disorder. As well might you expect the careful observance of all the ecclesiastical regulations of Theodore in England at the accession of Alfred, as the strict observance of the Mosaic law in a land harried by Canaanites, Midianites, Ammonites, and Philistines.¹ We have no space to dwell on this point. But the reformation under Samuel, if incomplete, implies the existence of institutions which it was possible to revive. And we should be as much justified in contending that the Second Commandment, the delivery of the cup to the laity, the discouragement of the worship of angels and saints, and the inculcation of tenderness and mercy in the Name of Jesus Christ, were unknown to the world till the days of Wiclif or Luther, as in asserting that the provisions of the Mosaic Law were not in existence because we find very little evidence of their being enforced.²

To examine all the various questions raised in Canon Driver's most learned and laborious work would require a volume. We can do no more than touch upon one or two further points in which his conclusions seem scarcely to have been established. One of these is the literary character of

¹ We must remember, moreover, that the historian does not profess to record all that happened. His silence about Mosaic rites may often have proceeded from his taking their observance for granted. He had not before him the thought of the minute, and it is to be feared sometimes rather captious, criticism of our times.

² It is not for a moment denied that there are some discrepancies between Deuteronomy and Leviticus, especially on the law of tithe, which cannot be cleared up. There is not the slightest wish on our part to attenuate the force of such considerations. All we say is, that while they may to some extent conflict with the Mosaic authorship of the whole of the Pentateuch, they are not sufficient to establish the conclusions which have of late been substituted for that opinion. A few discrepancies here and there may tend to establish the theory of a somewhat later date for portions of the Pentateuch in its present shape than has been supposed. But they are altogether too slight a foundation for the theory that the very core of the Ceremonial Law is subsequent to the Exile. The argument from such passages as Exod. xx. 24, 25, is met by the probability that it refers simply to the wanderings in the wilderness before the tabernacle was built, or to such unusual occasions as that mentioned in Deut. xxvii. 5, Josh. viii. 30. If there be a difficulty about this, it is not greater than the improbability that the redactor would have failed to see the contradiction between this passage and those in the Priestly Code, and that he would have taken no steps to reconcile the two statements.

the mingled Jehovistic and Elohist narrative known as JE. He admits that it is impossible to disentangle the two.¹ This is to surrender a rather important principle of the new criticism. That principle is that the writers of the Old Testament were compilers, not in any sense independent authors.² But if so, the Jehovistic and Elohist portions would have stood out separate and distinct, and would easily be separated from one another. If this is not the case, then the use of Jehovah or Elohim respectively is not a sufficient proof that a separate document is being used. Nor is this all. P, in regard to which the general consent of critics is pleaded, is itself not free from 'foreign elements.' In Leviticus such a foreign element is distinctly admitted in ch. xvii.-xxvi.³ Canon Driver very wisely excuses himself from following Kuenen in the elaboration of a P² and a P³.⁴ He admits that expressions characteristic of P are sometimes to be found in JE.⁵ And he also grants that P is based on pre-existing Temple

¹ *Int.* pp. 110, 118. Canon Driver remarks (p. 109) that 'liability to error warns the critic to express his judgment with reserve.' One is inclined to wish that this reserve had been extended also to the delimitation of P. It is impossible to forget that considerations of style might induce us, and have induced some, to divide the Epistle to the Romans into several distinct portions written by different authors. There is a marked difference in style between ch. v., ch. viii. and ch. xii. of that Epistle. And though larger sections in Genesis, where the names Jehovah and Elohim are exclusively used, do unquestionably suggest the idea of the embodiment of documents, yet in the parts where these names are inextricably intermingled, the use of either name for God is probably no greater proof of separate authorship than the occurrence in the Apostolic Epistles of 'Christ,' 'Jesus,' 'Christ Jesus,' or 'Jesus Christ.'

² We have not space to deal with the assertion that Hebrew historians were invariably compilers. Canon Driver, in the *Contemporary Review* for February 1890, attempts to show this by a comparison of Chronicles with Kings. But a comparison of 2 Kings xi. with 2 Chron. xxii. and xxiii. shows that this at least was not always the case. Nor can we deal with his inference from the words 'the priests the Levites' in Deuteronomy beyond the remark that it does not follow because the priests were all Levites, that the author means that all Levites were priests.

³ Certainly ch. xxvi. could hardly be cited as a specimen of the 'stereotyped, measured, and prosaic' P. A foreign element is also admitted in Gen. xxvi. *Int.* p. 10.

⁴ P. 45, note 1.

⁵ P. 124. But in Exod. xxx. xxxi. he does not refuse to see 'a secondary and posterior stratum to P, representing a later phase of ceremonial usage.' *Int.* p. 35. To what date, then, must the Old Testament in its present shape be assigned? For we find it fully and unreservedly accepted in its present shape in Egypt by 150 B.C. How long must it be supposed to have taken to effect the fusion of the older documents and foreign elements like P, and its 'secondary and posterior strata,' into a homogeneous whole?

usage,
from P
would
Profess
the wh
tangled
assump
trious a
confide
the tra
Genesis
form of
Pentate
meet us
later au
merchan
it occur
Captivi
are pecu
remarka
ence to
referred
assigned
culties i
no doub
neverthe
sumption
exact ve

¹ *Int.* p.

² It is
it, its aut
into the u
Darius), w
occurrence

³ In con
in which J
these verse
narrative is
v. II. Th
whatever is
the historic
Psalms, the
these consi
again to P.
But this is p
narrative.
would seem
another boo

usage, and that some portions of Deuteronomy are 'borrowed from P, or at least from a priestly collection of Tôrôth.'¹ It would seem far wiser to follow the example of critics like Professor Jebb in another field of investigation, and give up the whole enigma in despair, than to pin one's faith to such a tangled chain of doubtful inference, such a tissue of uncertain assumption, as presents itself in every page of this industrious and elaborate work. Nor does it inspire us with greater confidence to find that no notice is taken of such facts as the traces of ancient case-endings which Gesenius finds in Genesis, the use of the feminine rather than the masculine form of the personal pronoun third person singular in the Pentateuch, the large number of altogether new words that meet us in Judges, a circumstance usually supposed to imply later authorship. Such a phrase as 'current money with the merchant,' again, has the ring of true antiquity in it. Yet it occurs in P, in which, though *ex hypothesi* written after the Captivity, we find a remarkable absence of such words as are peculiar to other works of that date.² It is once more remarkable that all the Psalms which contain distinct reference to the history of Israel in its traditional shape are referred to post-exilic times, although competent critics have assigned a much earlier date to them.³ All these are difficulties in the way of accepting conclusions which, though no doubt well thought out and carefully elaborated, are nevertheless largely based on assumptions, and those assumptions, from the very nature of the case, incapable of exact verification. Even the doctrine, for instance, that the

¹ *Int.* pp. 135, 137.

² It is remarkable, for instance, that if P be of the date assigned to it, its author in mentioning money *never* slips, even by accident, into the use of such words as אֲדָרְכֹן or דִּרְכָּמֹן (Darics, coins of Darius), which are found in Chronicles, Ezra, and Nehemiah, and the occurrence of which in P would at once stamp it as post-exilic.

³ In connexion with this we may refer to the extremely uncritical way in which Josh. x. 12-15 is treated by Canon Driver. It is clear that these verses are a later interpolation, *which ends with v. 15*; for the narrative is resumed in v. 16, at the point at which it was broken off in v. 11. The proof of interpolation consists in this, *that no reference whatever* is made to the event of the standing still of the sun in any of the historic Psalms. The later the date to which we assign those Psalms, the later the interpolation. Yet Canon Driver overlooks all these considerations. He assigns 12^b-14^a to P, 14^b to D³, and 15-24 again to P. It must be admitted that the Alexandrian Codex omits v. 15. But this is probably because it is seen to interrupt the continuity of the narrative. The only possible explanation of its appearance in this place would seem to be that a redactor had here been adding a quotation from another book.

narrative of creation in Gen. i. contradicts the narrative of it in Gen. ii., or that the accounts of the Deluge in Gen. vi. differ from the accounts in Gen. vii. must be regarded as amounting to probability or possibility, rather than as resting on any definite proof. There is no evidence that the account of creation in Gen. i. is to be regarded as in chronological order.¹ It is quite possible that in Gen. i. we have the account of creation as it was in itself; in Gen. ii. the account of it as it affected man. The attempts at harmonizing the apparently conflicting statements in Gen. vii. concerning the numbers of the beasts taken into the ark are at least as reasonable a way out of the difficulty as the supposition that the various narratives can be separated as has been supposed. Each of these courses must be confessed to be desperate ways of escape from difficulties which we have not sufficient information to clear up. And as to the repetitions, repetition is admitted to have taken place for the sake of emphasis, even in P, as well as in J and E.² Lastly, we ask what authority there is for the purely arbitrary date fixed for J, E, and P. We are to remember that the date of P is still *sub judice*. The *consensus* of critics, on the whole, preponderates in favour of its being the oldest of the documents, assuming that it has been rightly distinguished from the rest of the narrative. Why should it not be at least as old as the time of David, as Dillmann inclines to believe? If it be granted that the Mosaic laws were not finally codified at the time when they were delivered—though the remarkable form of Exodus and Numbers, as well as the distinct references in Joshua to a book of the Law,³ seem strongly to indicate that they were then committed to writing—what time more probable for such a work than the days of that able and patriotic

¹ The order may have been of idea rather than of time. The Revised Version gives the only accurate rendering, 'and there was evening, and there was morning, a first, second, third day.'

² *Int.* p. 122. 'A thought is often repeated in slightly different words.'

³ These references are assigned by Canon Driver to the second Deuteronomist. This suggests several questions. First, was there *any* book whatever of the Law delivered to Joshua? Second, if so, of what did it consist? And thirdly, if no book of the Law was delivered to Joshua, what becomes of the statement that there was—and do not the conclusions of the more reverent and cautious advocates of the new criticism shade off imperceptibly into the coarser theories of Wellhausen and Kuenen? These questions are asked in no captious spirit. They represent difficulties which are very real to many minds. We are quite sure that Canon Driver and those who follow him do not wish to deny that 'the Lord spake by Moses.' But we are also quite sure that they give us no certain indication what He said.

mon
princi
histor
eviden
the gr
of suc

TH
strang
directi
of spe
Ps. xxv
exile, i
have us
that we
face at
It seem
earlier a
in later
cisely t
all com
afterwa
Gospels
sanctify
that sui
cesses.
we find
καίως,
strict th
Epistles.
argumen
Driver a
early wri
by David

We r
with whi
a marked
justly ad
of which
able to es

¹ *Int.* p.

² Wellh.

images was
of the braze
of a specific
the part of I
at haphazar

monarch whose greatness was owing to his fidelity to the principles of the Mosaic covenant? For the lower in the history of the Jewish kingdom we put it, the slighter the evidence for its historic accuracy, and the more unlikely from the gradual demoralization of Israel does it seem that a body of such enactments should have been drawn up and received.

There is a consideration of some weight, which has been strangely overlooked, but which points very decidedly in the direction of the early origin of P. The word *דביר* (oracle, place of speaking) is found only in Kings, in Chronicles, and in Ps. xxviii. 2. But if that word were in general use before the exile, it seems almost incredible that the writer of P should not have used it in his description of the Tabernacle. All, however, that we find in P is that 'Jehovah spake unto Moses face to face at the tent of meeting, as a man speaketh unto his friend.' It seems evident enough from this that in P we have the earlier account, and that from this account the word *דביר* came in later times to be used of the holy of holies. We find precisely the same phenomena in the New Testament. First of all comes the teaching of the founder of the religion, and afterwards its theological terminology. Thus we have in the Gospels Christ's teaching that He has come to save, redeem, sanctify, show favour to his people. In the Epistles we find that suitable words have been found to express these processes. With the single exception of *σωτηρία* in St. John iv. 22, we find neither this word, nor *χάρις*, nor *ἀγιασμός*, nor *δικαίωσις*, nor *ἀπολύτρωσις* in the Gospel narratives in their strict theological sense. We find them frequently in the Epistles. It is impossible not to feel that this is a strong argument for the priority of P. We may add that Canon Driver appears to regard 1 Kings vi. vii. as the work of an early writer, though he does not regard Ps. xxviii. as written by David.¹

We must not fail to do justice to the reverence of tone with which Canon Driver's book is written, and which presents a marked contrast to the reckless irreverence, and we might justly add, the insulting language of critics such as Wellhausen, of which we have already given specimens.² We may not be able to escape the conclusion that his canons of criticism place

¹ *Int.* pp. 180, 353.

² Wellhausen does not hesitate to declare that the prohibition of images was quite unknown to Moses, and that he sanctioned the worship of the brazen serpent. In those early days the religion of Israel was not of a specifically moral character. Gideon knows nothing of any guilt on the part of Israel in worshipping idols. These are a few specimens, selected at haphazard, of the new criticism in its legitimate results.

his readers on an inclined plane, down which the descent to a total rejection of Old Testament inspiration is only too easy. But we are bound to add that if this is the case, Canon Driver is himself unaware of it. He is himself a firm believer in the inspiration of the Old Testament, and holds the view which we must admit not to be in itself absolutely irreconcilable with such inspiration, that the Jewish law owes its origin to a gradual process of evolution. We only regret that in the pursuit of this theory admissions are made and principles laid down, which to persons not fascinated by the ingenuity of the German and Dutch school of critics appear to be fatal to the historic accuracy of the narrative as a whole, and thus practically to deny its Divine origin.

We have now placed before our readers—not an account of Canon Driver's book, for that were impossible in the space allotted to us, but a sketch of the principles on which it proceeds, confined exclusively, of necessity, to that portion of the Old Testament whose authority it most seriously affects. We gave a brief history of the analysis which ended in the separation of P from the rest of the narrative, and we showed that it was at least as probable that this extrication of P was due to the exigencies of theory as to undeniable facts which the eye of the trained critic alone can detect. We then examined the claim that the methods pursued were those usually employed in science, literature, and history. We showed that, on the contrary, the assumed discoveries rest largely upon authority, and that the suggested reconstruction of documents and the manner in which literary problems and historical narrations are dealt with, are not those usually employed in the researches into the history and literature of other countries. We then passed in review some instances of the methods themselves, and indicated some objections to the conclusions arrived at, which we thought had scarcely received sufficient attention. To these difficulties we may add the recent deliverance of Professor Klostermann, a critic of repute in Germany, a man of whom Canon Driver himself speaks with respect.¹ If we refer to it, it is in order to show that the agreement between German critics themselves is by no means so great as has been described.²

¹ *Int.* p. 44.

² Professor Klostermann's deliverance seems not a little to have 'fluttered the Volskians in Corioli.' Professor Cheyne's language concerning him in the *Expositor* for August is, perhaps, a little acid. He refers to the fact, almost as if it were surprising, that Professors Kautzsch and Socin have replied in a 'calm, conciliatory tone.' It is generally considered more advisable to answer your adversary than to call him

W
this.
of the
and h
tablis
are en
know
teuch.
pretat
which
and li

names
(Expos
dispute
certain
its resu
as he
length
as thou
beforeh
critic.
to ques
that Pr
textual
critic o
and cor
by all
'Don C
may ad
sense o
knowle
good de
For, as
sense is
ticular

¹ Pr
ings ma
present
harmon
is itself
rated fr
convert
closely
ments.
operator
conclus
(Moses
York, 1
these do
critical
historica
The bur

What, then, is the conclusion of the whole matter? Briefly this. There is no ground for the assertion that the dissection of the Old Testament into portions written at various periods, and by different authors, can claim to be 'scientifically' established. A large number of critics of note, whose opinions are entitled to respect, have agreed to separate what is now known as the 'Priestly Narrative' from the rest of the Hexateuch. This separation rests upon certain principles of interpretation, very many of which are arbitrary, and some of which, if we proceed upon the recognized canons of historical and literary investigation, are certainly at least unusual.¹ In

names and 'disable his judgment.' This 'Don Quixote of criticism' (*Expositor* for August, p. 157) has a right, *passe* Professor Cheyne, to dispute the assertion that the 'origin' of the sections ascribed to P 'is certain,' and even, if he pleases, to go so far as to ridicule the theory in its results, with its cumbrous notation, its J₁ and J₂, its E₁ and E₂, and as he further suggests, the endless redactors it requires, who may at length come to be denoted by R₁, R₂ and R₃. Professor Cheyne remarks, as though this quite settled the point, that Canon Driver has told us beforehand (*Int.* p. 162) not to trust Professor Klostermann as a textual critic. But with all respect for Canon Driver, we may venture at least to question his infallibility. It appears quite within the range of possibility that Professor Klostermann might be right in thinking Canon Driver's textual criticism a little at fault. Professor Klostermann is, at least, a critic of repute, and is therefore, one would imagine, as worthy of 'calm and conciliatory' treatment as Professors Kautzsch and Socin. Let him by all means be answered, if he can be answered. But to call him the 'Don Quixote of criticism' is rather worse than no answer at all. We may add that he is a man of wide and varied reading, and of a keen sense of humour. A little of this last quality, combined with a general knowledge like that of Professor Klostermann, would have prevented a good deal of recent Old Testament criticism from ever seeing the light. For, as a correspondent of the *Guardian* has recently remarked, common sense is at least as valuable a quality as learning and industry in this particular department.

¹ Professor Green's words may here be fitly quoted. 'If new meanings may be imposed on paragraphs or sentences incompatible with their present context, if variance may be created by expunging explanatory or harmonizing clauses, if discrepancy may be inferred from a silence which is itself produced by first removing the very statements that are desiderated from the connexion, if what are narrated as distinct events may be converted into irreconcilable accounts of the same transaction, the most closely connected composition can be rent asunder into discordant fragments. Such methods are subversive of all just interpretation. The operator imposes his own ideas upon the text before him, and draws conclusions which have no warrant but in the flights of his own fancy' (*Moses and His Recent Critics*, pp. 105, 106. Funk and Wagnall, New York, 1891). And again, 'There is no evidence of the existence of these documents and redactors, and no pretence of any, apart from the critical tests which have determined the analysis. All tradition and all historical testimony as to the origin of the Pentateuch are against them. The burden of proof lies wholly upon the critics. And this proof should

regard to the date of this 'Priestly Narrative' the critics are hopelessly divided. The later school maintain that it is the last, the earlier school that it is the first of the sources from which our present narrative is derived. A good many of the critics whose authority is pleaded in the matter have not approached the question without predispositions of their own, unfavourable to miracles and prophecy, and may, therefore, be not unfairly described as holding a brief for the later origin of the whole Hexateuch. But, as we have frankly acknowledged, between writers such as Wellhausen and Kuenen, and writers such as Canon Driver, there is a great gulf fixed. We have already indicated Wellhausen's point of view. Canon Driver's is far more conservative. He distinctly allows that the main current of Jewish legislation must be ascribed to Moses. Even P, to him, is simply the codification of pre-existent usage. So that the question, in his hands, becomes simply a question, not of the Mosaic authorship of the Jewish law, but simply of the origin of our present account of it, and of the probability that later additions of vast, if not supreme, importance had been subsequently interwoven with it. We do not in the least wish to saddle Canon Driver with conclusions which he would be the first to repudiate. But we should be doing less than our duty if we failed to point out that his canons of investigation are of a very unsafe kind, and must, if adopted, be very prejudicial to a belief in the historical character of the Old Testament. Moreover, if he freely admits that P is the codification of pre-existent usage, and 'that a considerable body of priestly Tôrôth existed previous to P, and permeated by the same dominant principles,'¹ he still regards all the early chapters in Leviticus, its sacrificial system, its observance of feasts, as of later date. Thus all the fundamental portions of the Jewish ritual—all that glory of symbol and type on which Christian theology is so largely founded, and which has always been believed to rest on the authority of a Divine revelation, is reduced at least to a secondary position, and belongs to an age in which the 'glory had departed' from Israel, when the light was almost quenched which had once played around her national life. We may reconsider the question whether Moses wrote the Pentateuch or not; we may recognize the presence of documents and 'foreign

be clear and convincing in proportion to the gravity and the revolutionary character of the consequences which it is proposed to base upon it' (*Ibid.* pp. 104, 105). It should be added that the article was written before these words came under the writer's notice.

¹ *Int.* p. 143.

elem
cauti
ques
thele
doub
of th
a cer
We
are i
the j
furth
to th
part
very
sacri
clusio
Reve
If th
But h
are tr
ticula
anyth
Testa
We a
demo
with
quenc
urgen
the H
practi
is use
'giver
anyth
such a
conce
of giv
is tru
procla

¹ T
narrow
to the
(Comm
added
Tabern
the Mo
idea, an
VOL

elements' occasionally in it; we may admit the necessity of caution and reserve in the presence of an historic and literary question of great difficulty and intricacy; but we may nevertheless be justified in taking up an attitude of philosophic doubt when we are told that the separation of P from the rest of the Hexateuchal narrative is a demonstrated fact, because a certain number of very able men have agreed to tell us so. We may retain our attitude yet more decidedly when we are informed that P is the last addition to the history of the Jewish people and their institutions. We may be still further justified in our scepticism when we are told that to this later date must be ascribed without fail the very part of the Jewish law which we had imagined to be the very core and centre of Mosaism—the law of festival and sacrifice. We are told that we are simply rejecting the conclusions of science because we assume that they are fatal to Revelation. That is not a fair representation of our attitude. If these theories are true, by all means let us embrace them. But before we embrace them, let us at least be sure that they are true. Our faith in Revelation does not rest on any particular theory concerning the origin of the Scriptures. But anything which diminishes the historic authority of the Old Testament tends also to diminish the authority of the New.¹ We are therefore entitled to demand clearer and more cogent demonstration in a case involving issues so grave, than those with which we might be content in a matter of lesser consequence. And we are justified in treating the question as one of urgency. Scholars may discuss the question of the origin of the Homeric poems at their leisure. It is not a question of practical moment. It is quite otherwise with a volume which is used in public religious instruction, and is propounded as 'given by inspiration of God.' It is a serious thing to say anything which may have the effect of shaking the credit of such a volume, the more especially when any doubts whatever concerning it are pleaded, as they often are pleaded, in favour of giving up the whole Christian scheme. 'Non-experts,' it is true, are warned off by those who are satisfied with the proclaimed results of critical investigation. But it is to non-

¹ The Bishop of Durham, who is the last man to be suspected of a narrow literalism, though he declines to discuss critical questions in relation to the account of the Tabernacle in the Pentateuch, says nevertheless (*Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews*, p. 233): 'Yet it must be added that it seems an incredible inversion of history to suppose that the Tabernacle was an imaginary ideal, constructed either from the Temple of the Monarchy or from the Temple of the Return.' Yet this is Wellhausen's idea, and it is adopted by Canon Driver without caution or remark.

experts that the appeal must ultimately be made; for they are deeply and closely interested in those results. They can no more leave the decision of a great question like this entirely to scholars than the population of this vast empire can leave questions of national defence and national government entirely to professional soldiers, sailors and politicians. It is possible, of course, to take the line of Mr. Gore in *Lux Mundi*, and assure non-experts in general that a belief in the criticism of Canon Driver and those who think with him will not in the least interfere with belief in Christ. But if we believe, or even have reasonable ground for supposing, that assumptions are made by experts which may undermine our whole belief in Revelation, in the character of the training by which God prepared the world for Jesus Christ, we are fully within our rights in demanding that these assumptions should be proved to the satisfaction of people in general, and in warning men not to accept them without such proof. We are especially justified in pointing out that this is a case where anything like definite proof is difficult, if not impossible, and that it is not unfrequently attempted by ordering all witnesses out of court on the other side. And we may therefore lament the surrender which many excellent men are disposed to make of the traditional view of Jewish history, from fear lest they should be found to make too great demands on the faith of their followers in these days of free discussion and inquiry. For the question, in spite of the positive assertions of 'men of light and leading,' is not settled—*cannot* be settled—on the grounds on which they profess to settle it. The so-called 'higher criticism' must be regarded as matter of opinion and conjecture, not of scientific demonstration. Even the question of the second Isaiah, which is supposed to be settled, and in favour of which there is doubtless much to be said, is not without its difficulties. As Dr. Stanley Leathes has shown,¹ the conclusion, whatever view we may take of it, rests upon grounds by which Isaiah might just as easily be assigned to four or five different hands. And one very practical consideration may be added to those we have advanced. On Canon Driver's principles, it will become utterly impossible to teach the Bible to any one of ordinary capacity or intelligence. Men of high scientific and mathematical attainments have already begun to remark that Canon Driver's volume is as abstruse and as difficult to understand as a chapter on the lunar theory. How can persons, lay or clerical, who are neither scholars nor critics, be indoctrinated into a complicated system which involves a J, an E, a D¹, a D², a P (and

¹ *The Law in the Prophets*, a volume well worthy of attention.

possibly a P² and a P³), an H, and a final redactor or redactors? What result would be produced if we tried to impart it to our Sunday School teachers and their scholars throughout the land? How can they be made to comprehend even the very rudiments of such a system? What would be the practical impression produced on their mind by this resolution of the history into its supposed constituent elements? What ideas would they form of its historic value if it became a first principle of our teaching that a very considerable number of the events recorded are so contradictory and irreconcilable as they stand, that they can only be explained by the supposition that an editor pieced them together without perceiving the contradictions?¹ And what effect would it have on Christian congregations to be told that the sacrificial and festal system of the Law, so wondrously foreshadowing the Sacrifice of Christ, was not, as it is clearly represented in Scripture to be, the palladium of Israel's prosperity, the source whence all prophetic inspiration flowed, the splendid deposit of truth whose neglect would be heavily avenged, but the development of some unknown germ of ceremonial enactment reserved till the period when it could not possibly receive adequate expression, in a temple the glory of which was but a shadow of that which had departed, in an age when Israel no longer enjoyed the favour of God, but was the degraded vassal of a foreign power? We are convinced that it is impossible that such a view of Jewish history can ever be accepted in the Christian Church at large, and still less by that portion of it which consists of a practical and common-sense people like ourselves.

Therefore, while we would protest against any premature adoption of the results of the new criticism, we would deprecate any needless anxiety. Let no one be in too great a hurry to denounce Canon Driver and those who think with him. There is no doubt a grain—perhaps even a good deal more than a grain—of truth at the bottom of all their theories, and we should learn from them caution against committing ourselves irrevocably to any particular doctrine in regard to the origin or date of the Pentateuch. But let us be still more careful not to commit ourselves to any theory which may ultimately be found incompatible with its historical accuracy as a whole. The methods of criticism to which we have called attention in the foregoing pages, involving, as they do, a constant

¹ That there may be *occasional* instances of such combination, as in the well-known instance of the account of Saul's introduction to David, may be accepted. But a narrative made up of such contradictions in almost every page can have little, if any, historic value.

manufacture of inconsistencies and contradictions, must in the end destroy our confidence in the truth of the narrative as it stands. And if we lose our confidence in the general accuracy of the narrative, how long, it may be permitted to ask, will our belief in its inspiration survive? It is therefore most important that the whole character and tendency of these new methods should be fully discussed, and that the conclusions to which they must finally lead, whether intended or not, should be clearly pointed out. We have no fear, we repeat, for the issue. English people, as a rule, have no very great love for fine-spun theories and ingenious systems. They may be trusted to 'think once, twice, thrice' before they adopt them. They may possibly be inclined in the long run to say of these conjectural reconstructions of their Bible what an English statesman once said of a combination equally ingenious and equally artificial: 'He put together a piece of joinery, so crossly indented and whimsically dove-tailed, a cabinet so variously inlaid; such a piece of diversified mosaic; such a tessellated pavement, without cement: here a bit of black stone and there a bit of white. . . . It was indeed a curious show, but utterly unsafe to touch, and unsure to stand upon.'

ART. V.—BISHOP CHARLES WORDSWORTH'S
AUTOBIOGRAPHY.

Annals of My Early Life, 1806-1846. With Occasional Compositions in Latin and English Verse. By CHARLES WORDSWORTH, D.D., D.C.L., Bishop of St. Andrews and Fellow of Winchester College. (London, 1891.)

THE historian of the Church of England during the nineteenth century is not likely to complain that a superabundance of materials is not provided for his guidance. There is, indeed, greater danger of embarrassment from a plethora rather than a poverty of authorities. Each portion of the penultimate past is being flooded with light by means of *mémoires pour servir*, and by biography from every section of Church opinion. The comparative slumber of the eighteenth century, the origin and progress of the Evangelical revival, the character of the Oxford Movement and the consequent and wondrous spread of Catholic principles, the growth of educational reform of every shade and grade, are still con-

stantly being illustrated by new publications. And amidst them all there is ample room and a cordial welcome for the record of a life so full of scholarly and ecclesiastical interest as that of Dr. Charles Wordsworth, the venerable Bishop of St. Andrews.

It would afford a curious subject for discussion to decide what occult forces determine the direction which literary activity shall take at any particular period. Is the modern theory of averages valid in the sphere of literature? Are there separate literary microbes, which, in a special mental or material condition, find an environment so suited to their development as to flourish at the expense of all competing germs. Outward circumstances may account for the change in some departments of letters, such as the decay in our time of elegance and finish in epistolary correspondence and the extraordinary growth of periodical literature; but is it possible to trace the causes why a sort of epidemic breaks out at times amongst authors, so that poetry and philosophy and history and *belles lettres* become each the rage for a season and then again decline? Is there anything, for example, in the circumstances of the present moment exceptionally favourable to the genesis of that form of biography in which the writer is the hero of his own story? These questions are suggested by the fact that Bishop Charles Wordsworth's *Annals* appears at a season when it has been literally raining autobiographies, and every variety of writer is adopting this form of composition. Autobiography has, of course, its advantages and its dangers. The latter are sufficiently obvious. The varnish and restraint of modern culture may conceal, they cannot eradicate, the innate egotism which is a universal ingredient in human nature. When it was complained that Macaulay would not let anyone talk but himself, Lord Houghton rejoined, 'Nor would anyone else if he could help it.' But interesting as we all are to ourselves, we are not equally so to others, and it is perilously easy to pass the narrow line which separates the amusing egotist from the intolerable bore. On the other hand, autobiography, when skilfully manipulated, has an irresistible charm. In the easy flow of personal narrative we live over again the scenes through which the writer conducts us.

Bishop Charles Wordsworth is keenly sensitive to the dangers we have indicated, and has endeavoured, not without some success, to minimise them. His *Early Annals* are the record of years singularly devoid of incident, and engrossed in scholastic pursuits and ecclesiastical interests, first as a scholar

at Harrow and Christ Church, and then as an Oxford tutor and as a master at Winchester. But the writer has thoroughly grasped the force of the maxim, 'Si vis me flere, dolendum est primum ipsi tibi,' and his own vivid enjoyment of the long past which his pages reproduce is contagious. That old age should encircle its memories with a golden atmosphere is natural enough, but the cases are rare in which an octogenarian bishop can throw himself back into so distant a time with so much of the sprightliness and elasticity of early days as these pages display. How far it is wise to introduce so largely, as Dr. Charles Wordsworth has done, complimentary letters from friends is an open question, to which we may again return at a later page. If the picture be worth painting, which we do not question, we should wish to have it complete; but the skilful artist will produce a more vivid portrait, without the insertion of every line, than the most careful photograph can secure. The author has (he reminds us) outlived the days when men lay much store by earthly commendation, from whatever quarter it may come. Nor can we entirely acquiesce in the wisdom of the author's decision to extend his autobiography to two volumes. In his judgment, the lighter material of his earlier life requires to be kept apart from the graver tenor of his later years. But there is nothing throughout these *Early Annals* at all inconsistent with subsequent development into a bishopric, and a simple, straightforward piety gives a chastened tone to the narrative. On purely literary grounds further compression would have been an unquestionable gain.

Charles Wordsworth came into the world on August 22, 1806, under conditions of somewhat exceptional advantage. He was the second son of Dr. Christopher Wordsworth, who at Charles's birth was Rector of Woodchurch and chaplain to Archbishop Manners-Sutton, through whose interest he subsequently became Master of Trinity and Rector of Buxted. To such blue ribbons scholastic and ecclesiastical—and those who know the sweet Sussex rectory of Buxted will not think the term an exaggerated one—was also added the Chaplaincy of the House of Commons. An elder brother, John, born in 1805, and a younger, Christopher, in after years the well-known Bishop of Lincoln, comprised all the family who survived the death of their mother at the early age of thirty-three. Forty years afterwards, when Charles Wordsworth paid a hurried visit to his mother's grave, he found it covered with fresh green turf, which was yearly laid on it by an old woman who thus gratefully cherished her memory. Owing

to some delicacy of constitution, Charles was sent to Harrow, that he might be near Mrs. Hoare at Hampstead, who showed little less than a mother's care to the three motherless boys, and whose house became a second home to them all. His brothers went to Winchester. An eager love for athletics, and a special facility of Latin versification, were the essential elements in those days of an ideal public schoolboy, and Charles possessed both in ample measure. At times his devotion to sports was so excessive that the doctor feared he would not live to be twenty. When the cricket season was over he applied himself with energy to bookwork, read hard at extra subjects, and carried off many prizes. The *Annals* afford but meagre insight into schoolboy life at Harrow in Wordsworth's days; yet the character of the religious training may be gauged by the fact that the only preparation for the solemn rite of Confirmation was an inquiry from his master whether he knew his Catechism, and that no one of the boys confirmed received the Holy Eucharist. The classical training, doubtless, was more complete, and elegance in poetical composition was severely, if not appropriately, tested by competition for prizes on such romantic themes as the death of the gluttonous and learned Dr. Parr.

Amongst the more memorable events of schoolboy days cricket stands out prominently in these *Early Annals*. Dr. Wordsworth played in the first match between Harrow and Eton in 1821 at Lord's, and to his left-hand bowling the triumph of Harrow was so clearly assignable that the Eton boys engaged a left-handed professional to train them for the next year's encounter. In the first match with Winchester in 1825 Charles was less successful. His brother Christopher knew his bowling and cut it about unmercifully; and he further distinguished himself by catching out 'Henry Manning,' who played that year for Harrow. We wonder whether the Cardinal retains the same keen interest in his own early prowess as his Harrow contemporary.

'*In school*, as I was second in the order of the sixth (the highest) form, so as a scholar I was only second in distinction to the one boy who was above me; while *out of school* I was *facile princeps*. In short, as a boy I was a greater man than I have been at any subsequent period of my life' (p. 25).

Another incident of Harrow cricketing days illustrates the kindly nature and simple grace of Canning. The story has already been twice told, and we need not repeat it here; but it may afford opportunity for recording another example of Canning's kindness of heart which the present writer heard

on trustworthy authority, and which has probably not appeared before in print. When prime minister, Canning went to spend a Sunday in a country village where a young clergyman was about to preach his first sermon, and just before the service some one told him that Mr. Canning was in the church. The young man's nervousness was really distressing. On learning the cause of it Canning remarked—not addressing himself to the confused preacher, but intentionally within his hearing—that the sermon contained some excellent points, and he foretold that the young man would be a success.

Life at Oxford was a repetition of Harrow days writ large. There was the same ardent pursuit of athletic sports, the same eager, though not uninterrupted, application to study, the same occasional breakdown through sickness, and the same brilliant success in both fields of emulation. The arena was extended and the competition keener, but Wordsworth went up to Christ Church so well equipped that he soon secured distinction. The son of the Master of Trinity necessarily brought some acquaintance with the Cambridge manner of life to the sister University, and the comparison, in his judgment, was unfavourable to Oxford. As there were not rooms enough at Christ Church for all its *alumni*, men were allowed the use of unoccupied rooms until their rightful tenants appeared, sometimes after nightfall, and turned the intruders adrift. Discomfort reigned in this most aristocratic of Colleges. The attic roofs were not water-tight. Even rooms in Tom Quad had never been battened and were intolerably draughty. Chimneys had acquired a prescriptive right of three hundred years to smoke, and could only be cured by holes driven under the grate right through the college walls. Mice swarmed to such an extent that

'they would actually come running across the table and over the pages of the book which I was reading, or even gnaw at the lighted candles. In the morning, when I put on my dressing-gown, "a beastie," as the Scotch say, would run out of the sleeve, where it had been sleeping cosily during the night' (p. 79).

These material inconveniences were not softened by kindly good fellowship between the dons and undergraduates of that period. Charles Wordsworth writes to his brother Christopher, under date April 28, 1826 :

'On my journey here, I had the pleasure of travelling the greater part of the way with one of our Christ Christ tutors. Though I was in lecture with him all last term, and am at present, and though for the last sixteen miles we two were the only persons outside, he

did
"H
(p-
Th
the
stru
suc
que
Wo
Pee
tha

all
tion
Lat
the
in u
Mr.
mar
the
so h
valu
upo
cier
rew
first
had

dev
skat
form
fath
wor

Whe
whic
dispe
hom
ing a
well
early
cont

I
write
page

did not favour me with a single syllable—no, not as much as “How d’ye do?” Oh! the amiableness of Oxford manners’ (p. 36).

The men who held themselves so proudly aloof did little for the scholastic training of their pupils—for their religious instruction nothing at all. No wonder that men educated under such a system should be utterly unfit to deal with Church questions. ‘Sir Robert Peel,’ said Gladstone one day to Wordsworth, who was complaining of some proceedings when Peel was prime minister, ‘knows no more about the Church than that stone!’

The year 1828 was a proud one at Trinity Lodge, when all three sons simultaneously carried off University distinctions. The Porson Prize was won by John Wordsworth. The Latin ode, epigrams, and English verse by Christopher, and the Oxonian Latin verse by Charles. Congratulations poured in upon the gratified father, and the Duke of Wellington told Mr. Goulburn that he considered Dr. Wordsworth the happiest man in England; nor do we wonder (as the author does) that the great soldier should have appreciated academic honours so highly. The brother of the Marquis Wellesley might well value elegant scholarship, and men often set especial store upon the qualities in which they are themselves most deficient. Charles Wordsworth’s success ensured the substantial reward of his nomination by the Dean to a studentship, the first instance, we are assured, in which the coveted position had been bestowed for merit.

A considerable section of the author’s life at Oxford is devoted to his prowess in cricket and rowing, in tennis and skating. The interest which attaches to his share in the two former is quite exceptional, if he is rightly regarded as the father of the University contests. On this point Dr. Wordsworth shall speak for himself:

‘Of the inter-university cricket match that is *certainly true*. Whether or no it is equally true of the rowing match—a point upon which there has been a slight difference of opinion—it *cannot be disputed* that the circumstance of my being an Oxford man while my home was at Cambridge, and the peculiar advantages I had in forming acquaintances in both, *had much* to do with the latter incident as well as the former: *so much*, indeed, that after I took my degree, early in 1830, both the boat race and the cricket match were discontinued for six years, viz. till 1836’ (p. 57, note).

For details of these athletic laurels, over which the aged writer lingers lovingly, we must refer our readers to his own pages. It must suffice to say that Charles Wordsworth not

only held a foremost place both for batting and bowling in the University eleven, but also pulled four in the first University boat race at Henley. The rowing match took place on a Wednesday, the cricket match on the following Friday, and in both Oxford was victorious. Fifty years later, at the jubilee banquet, the guernsey which Wordsworth had rowed in and carefully preserved, was, in his own enforced absence, hung over the president's chair, and during his oration held up by Mr. Justice Chitty to the admiration of the company, an incident duly embalmed in Latin verse by Mr. Kynaston,¹ and translated by Mr. Justice Denman, as follows :

'Ipse viros numerat laudatque, et fortia narrat
Dum facta, in medium mirantibus omnibus effert
Quâ tunicâ indutus sudavit Episcopus olim.'

'Turns triumphant to the guernsey
By a reverend prelate sent ;
Reads that, though to come he burns, he
Must not come, or he'd repent,
For that, wheresoe'er he turns, he
Duties finds, because 'tis Lent' (p. 60).

These doughty deeds by flood and field did not seriously distract their author from the more important business of his college days. He laid down two wholesome rules for his own guidance, and strictly adhered to them. One was, never to have a pack of cards in his rooms ; the other, never to give a supper party, and rarely, if ever, a breakfast party. Ill-health, however, sadly interfered with his reading, both during term-time and the long vacations, and it was probably owing to this cause that he twice failed to secure 'the Ireland.' But in the final examination his name, with only four others, appeared in the first-class.

The reminiscences of Oxford contain some amusing anecdotes, from which we will only cull a few specimens of Dean Gaisford's singular laconism. In reply to a letter from Lord Liverpool, which, with many compliments on his vast learning, announced his appointment to the Greek Professorship, Gaisford replied, 'My Lord, I have received your letter, and accede to the contents. T. G.' In acknowledging the loan from Trinity College Library of Porson's copy of *Suidas*, which had been sent with a courteous letter from the Master, and congratulations on his recent appointment to the deanery, his only answer was, 'Dear Sir, I have Porson's copy of *Suidas*, *Kasteri*, 3 vols. folio, and am much obliged to your-

¹ The Chairman.

self and the College.' It was a current story at Oxford that he once wrote to the father of an undergraduate: 'Dear Sir, Such letters as yours are a great annoyance to your obedient servant, T. Gaisford.' This severe brevity rivals the terseness of a laconic testator whose last will and testament, we have been seriously assured, was duly executed and admitted to probate, although it consisted only of the three monosyllables, 'All to wife.'

The list of Charles Wordsworth's Oxford friends comprises many illustrious names. His early school friendships and the social eminence of his father gave him exceptional advantages, and it is not a little quaint to read in a fragment of his diary, 'In all societies, it is advisable to associate, if possible, with the highest'—a maxim which recalls the millionaire's advice, 'invariably to take turtle and Château Yquem at dinner.' No doubt, as the youthful moralist observed, 'In the grand theatre of life a box ticket takes us through the house. So, it is better to be at Christ Church than at any other college.' But then every one is not born with the silver spoon of Charles Wordsworth. *Non cuivis homini contingit adire Corinthum.* College boating and cricket, riding and tennis, are not inexpensive pursuits, and when we learn that the last occasionally cost as much as eighteen shillings a day, it is obvious that such an outlay, added to the fees of private tutors during both vacation and term times, involved a greater allowance than the average university man can command. Liberal as the Master of Trinity was to his children, we are not astonished that his second son began to take private pupils as soon as he had graduated. His position enabled him to select from the men who offered themselves those only who were personally acceptable, and it is with pardonable pride that he dwells at some length upon the nine distinguished men whom he 'coached' for their degrees. They were: James Hope, W. E. Gladstone, H. E. Manning, Francis Doyle, Walter K. Hamilton, Lord Lincoln, Thomas D. Acland, Charles J. Canning, and Francis L. Popham. Their university record was not a little remarkable. Two of them took a double first, one a classical first and mathematical second, three classical firsts, two (under peculiar circumstances) a common degree; three were elected Fellows of Merton, and three Fellows of All Souls. Nor was this early promise belied by their subsequent career. It is not many tutors who can boast of having had a Prime Minister, a Governor-General of India and a Secretary at War, a member of the Home Episcopate and a Cardinal of the Latin Church,

an Oxford Professor of Poetry and a leader of the Parliamentary bar, in a batch of pupils not more numerous than the Muses.

A few brief extracts—they must be very few—from Wordsworth's 'affectionate remembrance' of some of them may interest the reader. A special fascination enshrines the memory of Mr. R. Hope-Scott, whose name stands amongst the foremost of those who under Newman's influence unhappily joined the Church of Rome. Dr. Wordsworth's

'impression is that he was led to take this step more or less directly from dissatisfaction with the course pursued by the Archbishop and other authorities of Church and State in the foundation of the Jerusalem bishopric, against which he published a pamphlet. . . . The then Bishop of Exeter (Phillpotts) had such an opinion of Hope, though he must have been some thirty or forty years his junior, that when he (the bishop) was in London he used frequently to come and take a quiet luncheon with him on Sundays (on all other days Hope was too much engaged) in order to pick his brains upon points of ecclesiastical law. And his speech, afterwards published, in defence of cathedrals upon a Bill then before the Committee of the House of Lords, produced such an effect that when he sat down Lord Brougham was overheard to mutter "that young man's fortune is made"' (pp. 81, 82).

Between Mr. Gladstone and his Oxford tutor there were other ties than those formed by the pursuit of learning. Both were keen politicians—Tories of the most pronounced type, utterly opposed to reform, and both alike heading the Oxford agitation against it. Wordsworth wrote, 'Gladstone is quite furious in the cause.' So inveterate was Wordsworth's partisanship that he could recognise neither ability nor merit in any of his opponents, and such men as Lowe and Tait were set down as 'nobodies' because they supported the Reform Ministry, which Gladstone denounced in 'the most splendid speech, out and out, that was ever heard in our society—not excepting Sunderland's Shelleian harangue.' Blinded as the writer admits he was by his enthusiasm, he yet maintained that he was even then no mean judge of oratory, and we cannot forbear quoting his own illustration of the eager interest he took at this time in public affairs:

'I was present in the House of Commons when Lord John Russell reintroduced the Reform Bill in the new Parliament of Lord Grey, 1831. . . . I was also present in the House of Lords during the whole of the debate, which lasted great part of five days and nights—October 9 to 13—and ended in the rejection of the Bill by a majority of forty-one, at six o'clock in the morning, notwithstanding

Lord
to pa
a fro
repor
as the
as thi
potts
rema
that p
(a W
on pu
things
gone
when
that h
up to
Hous
readin
(pp. 8

N
vivid
passa
lerate
and f
here
in al
is en
Mr.
the r
cost t
are t
41,00
high
enter
of na

I
of th
denth
hints
chara
room
hour,
he fo
worth

' I
much

Lord Brougham had *knelt* upon the woolsack,¹ and prayed the Peers to pass the measure. On one of the nights, when I had secured a front seat in the gallery, as it then was, immediately behind the reporters, I remember one of them turned round and said to me, as the debate was going on, "You will never hear anything so good as this in the Commons"; and when the Bishop of Exeter (Phillpotts) sat down after a speech of nearly two hours, another reporter remarked, "Canning, in his best days, never did anything to equal that peroration." On the night of the division, Edward Twisleton (a Whig and ardent Reformer) had accompanied me to the gallery on purpose to hear Brougham's concluding speech, of which great things were expected. We had sat continuously from 12.30 (having gone so early to secure our places) till about four in the morning, when Brougham rose. But Twisleton was so thoroughly tired out that he had fallen asleep, and it was all I could do to waken him up to listen to his favourite orator. Again I was present in the House of Lords, on April 13 of the following year, when the second reading of the Bill was carried by a majority of nine, at 6.45 A.M.' (pp. 82, 83).

Nothing, probably, in the entire volume brings out so vividly the patriarchal standing of its author as does this passage. The universe must surely have moved at an accelerated pace since that old-world time of close corporations, and rotten boroughs, and stupendous bribery. The glimpse here afforded into a past far more distant from our own days in all essential conditions than the mere space of sixty years, is enlarged by a letter written to Charles Wordsworth by Mr. Gladstone in December 1830, in which he relates that the recent election at Liverpool was currently said to have cost the candidates 82,000*l.*: 'my brother says Ewart's expenses are the greater of the two, and he knows Denison's to be 41,000*l.*' Two years later Gladstone was returned by the high Tory Duke of Newcastle as member for Newark, and entered upon a political 'career which has become not only of national, but of world-wide importance.'

It is with some disappointment that we peruse the letters of the great Liberal statesman to a tutor for whom he evidently had cordial affection and respect. Yet a few pregnant hints may be gathered by the attentive reader. It is thoroughly characteristic to learn that he invariably entered his tutors' rooms so punctually as to lose no fraction of his allotted hour, and that when working intensely hard for his degree he found much pleasure in reading selections from Wordsworth 'in the interstices of evening cram.' There was surely

¹ It was maliciously said that he could not *stand*, having taken too much brandy and water in the course of his speech.

a forecast of that imperiousness of nature—we use the word in no severe sense—which is indispensable in some degree to a leader of men, in his consciousness that his manner and temper were ‘not the best qualified of all for a tutor to manage, or even to bear with.’ Was the great future financier in earnest when he spoke of his mathematical prospects, as appalling, and his memory as notoriously bad? or was he only using the wide licence of self-depreciation universally allowed to a ‘double first’? Once only in his Oxford career was he handsomely beaten, when in company with Scott he was second for the Ireland, which was carried off by Brancker, a Shrewsbury boy, who only came up to the examination just to try his hand at it. Even then Gladstone was *proxime accessit*, and might have won the day but for answers of excessive prolixity, and for an essay ‘desultory beyond belief.’

Work with private pupils at Oxford was agreeably diversified by a long tour through Northern Europe as tutor to Lord Cantelupe, and any lack of geniality with his companion was compensated by the picturesque beauty of Norway, and by intercourse with Schleiermacher and Neander, with Böckh and Bekker at Berlin. Meanwhile his college friends, Claughton and Hamilton and Roundell Palmer, kept him well informed of what was going on at Oxford, where Oriel was beginning to be the centre of determined resistance to impending attacks upon Church doctrine. The extracts from their letters which Bishop Wordsworth gives us accord too exactly with what we know from other sources about the sequence of events and the personal character of his correspondents to call for remark; but a few sentences from one of Lord Selborne’s letters affords so complete a key to the subsequent grand and spotless career of the writer, that we cannot refrain from reproducing them. The letter is dated September 14, 1835,¹ when Wordsworth was just settled at Winchester:—

‘I go into a conveyancer’s office early in November. I have been reading much more steadily all this summer than at any previous time which I can remember; both at law, classics, and divinity, besides modern miscellaneous books. My love of the classics is much increased, and I have formed a deliberate resolution to give them a certain portion of every day (except Sundays) hereafter; by which means I hope in the course of a few years to become master of the whole range of ancient literature—not critically, but substantially. Even in law I take considerable pleasure and interest; and

¹ He had finished his university course the year before with extraordinary *éclat*.

I tr
end
gain
be c
that
oppo
upon

Jun
Duk
fame
mer
saw
attra
enga
Miss
daug
enfor
fello
look
mar
Win
over
a W
reca
—giv
whom
ward
wort
and
Gene
datur

B
caree
life s
safed
born
she e
the fo
patho

Mrs.
and H

I trust, if God continues to give me grace, to make His glory the end and object of all my studies, by which a power is unquestionably gained for the right or wrong use of which all who possess it must be deeply responsible. May God grant, my dearest Wordsworth, that you may so use the . . . which He has given you, and the opportunities of your present situation, as to call down His blessing upon yourself and upon all within your influence !' (p. 155).

The engagement with Lord Cantelupe terminated in June, and Wordsworth was present at the installation of the Duke of Wellington as Chancellor, and heard the three famous false quantities fall from his lips. Later in the summer he again went abroad, and at the gallery of the Louvre saw a young lady by whose appearance he was so much attracted that he obtained an introduction, and was speedily engaged to her. It was literally a case of love at first sight. Miss Charlotte Day was one of the portionless and orphan daughters of a Norfolk clergyman, and as celibacy was enforced for many years later than this period upon the fellows of colleges at both universities, it was necessary to look out for some post which would enable the lovers to marry. In the following summer the second mastership at Winchester became vacant. The appointment was worth over 1,000*l.* a year, but it had never been held by anyone but a Wykehamist. It is with pardonable pride that Wordsworth recalls the array of testimonials—above a hundred in number—given in his favour. They comprised letters from men of whom one became Archbishop of Canterbury, ten were afterwards bishops, one a cardinal, and eleven deans. Of Wordsworth's lay supporters, one has been since prime minister, and another Lord Chancellor; two more became Governor-Generals of India, and four Cabinet ministers. Such a candidature was irresistible, and Wordsworth was elected.

Before proceeding to speak of Wordsworth's Winchester career, we will complete the too brief episode of the wedded life so romantically begun. Four swift years only were vouchsafed them, and the young wife, in giving birth to her first-born child, was called away. She was only twenty-two when she entered into rest, and the scholar who had lost her placed the following Latin couplet, inimitable in its terse and tender pathos, on her tomb:

I, nimum dilecta, vocat Deus : i, bona nostræ
Pars animæ : mœrens altera, discere sequi.

Mrs. Charles Wordsworth died on Ascension Day, 1839, and her elder brother-in-law followed her on the 31st of

December. On the very day of his death the motherless babe arrived from Winchester at Trinity Lodge, and was greeted by her uncle Christopher in a fashion characteristic of a family where poetic gifts, scholarly acquirements, and deep mutual affection were combined in unusual measure.

ἡλθες ἀδακρύνῃ φαιδρὸν γελάουσα προσώπῳ
 ἄψαντος τ' ὀδύνας δώματ' ἐς ἡμέτερα.
 ἡλθες ὅθ' ἡμετέρου θάνατον πενθόνμεν ἀδελφοῦ
 σήμερον ἐκ τούτων οἰχομένου μελάβρων.
 ὦ βρέφος, ἀλλὰ σὺ χαῖρε, φίλον· κείνου δ' ἐπὶ τύμβῳ
 ὥστε ῥόδον θάλλεις ἄνθεσι πορφυρέοις.

The period embraced by Wordsworth's mastership at Winchester is hardly of such general interest as his life at Oxford. English public schools were just beginning to shake off something of the long lethargy which had enfolded them, and Wordsworth inaugurated at Winchester many reforms of a like character to those which Arnold was enforcing at Rugby. It is singular that two men in such positions should have been simultaneously engaged in successful efforts to re-establish true Christian boyhood in these great seminaries, each one in entire ignorance of what the other was doing. Indeed, Wordsworth strove to kindle a spirit of zeal amongst the boys on the ground that they might be the foremost to set an example of resistance to ungodliness and of simple unaffected piety.

'Let it be *granted*, even, that other public schools *may* be deficient in the same all-important points of a Christian education. From whence, but from this ancient and religious foundation—the first of all in the honoured precedence of time, and second to none in every accomplishment of worldly wisdom—from whence but from among us should this holy flame be kindled, and passing, as it were, like a beacon fire from hill to hill throughout the land, announce the tidings that this, our stronghold, had been wrested from the hand of the adversary, and become a citadel of the most High God?' (p. 205).

It was assuredly one of Wordsworth's most valuable characteristics that he went straight to the heart and root of things. In the promotion of personal piety, private prayer—in that of scholarship, sound grammar—in the formation of character in boyhood, gentlemanly recreation, are the essential points, and Wordsworth devoted himself assiduously to the furtherance of all three. His peculiar position under the system then in vogue at Winchester of separate and almost uncontrolled responsibility for the college boys, as distinguished from the commoners who were the special charge of

the H
 prop
 second
 wrote
 to co
 was c
 office
 not in
 have
 serio
 long
 sible
 and t
 the re
 worth
 reade
 and
 was e
 It
 what
 the in
 was c
 worth
 in the
 and g
 to Ar
 perso
 fully
 to his
 Word
 suggest
 had n
 had n
 widel
 schoo
 a gen
 Winc
 Arnol
 way,
 W
 reform
 these
 ing of
 condi
 jokes
 VO

the head master, added to the circumstance that so large a proportion of the prefects were college boys, gave him as second master exceptional importance, and Wordsworth writes of his work with all the freedom of one who had only to consult his own judgment, and whose spontaneous action was entirely unfettered by the supervision of any superior officer. Whether any friction arose in consequence we are not informed, although Wordsworth confesses that there may have been some ground at one time for the complaint of serious jealousy between Moberly and himself. But after so long an interval, it is scarce worth while to revert to possible failings by which the best of human works are marred, and the testimony is too general to allow of our questioning the reality and extent of the improvement effected by Wordsworth in the religious tone of the Winchester boys. The reader of the *Annals* will fully concede his claim to a real and independent share in whatever change for the better was effected.

It might have seemed needless so elaborately to assert what none probably would have desired to dispute. But in the intervals of poetic inspiration the prophet of Rydal Mount was ever on the alert to vindicate the rights of the Wordsworths, and he had observed, with much displeasure, a letter in the life of Dr. Arnold, in which Moberly spoke of the real and great improvement at Winchester as mainly attributable to Arnold 'more than to any advice or example of any other person.' In writing thus, Charles Wordsworth holds (and we fully agree with him) that Moberly did less than justice both to himself and his colleague. To Arnold himself Charles Wordsworth was not in any way indebted either for the suggestion of his work or for his mode of performing it. He had not been brought in any way under Arnold's influence; had not read any of his school sermons. It has been far too widely assumed that all modern improvement in public schools should be traced to Rugby. 'The truth is, there was a general awakening, which in many instances, as with us at Winchester, *partook decidedly of a Church character*, such as Arnold's teaching and example, however excellent in their way, had little or no tendency to create' (p. 278).

We have not space to enter at length upon the subject of reform in Greek Grammar, which occupies so large a space in these *Early Annals*. Half a century ago the elementary teaching of Greek in English schools was in a most unsatisfactory condition. We can recall the sarcastic comments and classic jokes upon the errors of the primers then in vogue. "An

gaudet optativo, was a dictum invariably followed in our own school experience by the remark that *av* must exercise remarkable self-denial, as it was never found in the optative's company. But important as is the part filled by grammars or dictionaries in classical education, the discussion of the subordinate interests which hindered the immediate adoption of a better book, and the quotation of a score of letters bearing upon the minuter details of points that have been settled fifty years ago, hardly possess more than a shadowy technical interest at the present day, and they do but serve to impede the movement of the history which lingers over them. We live in too hurried a day to care much about the order in which individual head masters accepted a reform which all alike admitted to be inevitable. This critical impatience (if such it be) must not lead us to overlook the invaluable service which Charles Wordsworth rendered to Greek scholarship by his labours—a service which was by no means restricted to that elementary teaching which necessarily underlies all really sound learning.

An exposition of the new grammar's merits was undertaken by Roundell Palmer for the *British Critic* and by Christopher Wordsworth for the *Quarterly Review*. The former article contained an elaborate analysis and comparison of twelve other Greek Grammars then in use, and gave the preference to Wordsworth's in terms of high eulogy. 'His work may safely be described as a more complete magazine of the facts of the language than can be found even in the elaborate volumes of the best among the German grammarians' (p. 189). Even if this praise were somewhat excessive, it might serve to compensate for the disappointment occasioned by the suppression of the article designed for the *Quarterly*. It had been both printed and corrected when the writer was informed that its publication would give offence, and therefore it must be abandoned. In the course of his investigations, Christopher Wordsworth had discovered that the famed Eton Greek Grammar was not an Eton book at all. It was the work of Camden, the famous antiquary, a former head master of Westminster, and had been discarded for two centuries at Westminster. The pride of Eton could not brook so damaging a revelation, and subsequent negotiations failed to secure its recognition as the standard Greek Grammar for all public schools.

Of Dr. Wordsworth's work at Winchester, the best summary is given by an old pupil—boys are keen and true judges of those set over them—in the following graphic language:—

'I should like to say a word about the Bishop of St. Andrews when second master. No finer athlete ever entered a school, and no master ever did more to promote all that was noble and manly among boys; and no man had more tact in proposing changes. In my time, during my later years at Winchester, Mr. Wordsworth, as he then was, took an immense interest in cricket and all manly sports . . . In 1836 he was mainly instrumental in getting the college to form a new ground in "Meads." . . . He also laid out a small ground for the junior boys, and in my later days he always gave leave from every roll-call for fellows playing in matches. . . . I believe he was as fond of Cicero as he was of cricket, and he certainly made many boys like *both* and understand *both*. He never meddled with old-established customs; but his suggestions were generally accepted; and when he suggested to prefects that quiet should be kept in chambers at nine o'clock p.m., for ten minutes, to enable boys, who wished to do so, to say their prayers (in 1838), it was carried out at once; as was another suggestion that on half holidays, when leave from roll-calls was given from two o'clock till eight for matches, prefects should discontinue the twelve o'clock practice and give the fags a rest' (p. 235).

Twelve years of laborious work at Winchester told severely upon a constitution that had never been thoroughly robust, and in 1846 Dr. Wordsworth sent in his resignation, to the sincere regret alike of the head master and the Warden. His energy and scholarship were too marked to allow of his remaining permanently in a secondary position, and there was no immediate prospect that a vacancy would occur through such promotion as Moberly eventually and deservedly obtained. But the success which had attended his efforts had stamped him as a school reformer of no ordinary merit, and his experience, added to his unswerving loyalty to sound Church principles, marked him out as exceptionally fitted to rule the new public school which some leading Scotch Episcopalians, amongst the foremost of whom were Sir John Gladstone and Mr. Hope-Scott, were founding at Glenalmond. Mr. W. E. Gladstone took a deep interest in the matter, and urged on his old friend and tutor the importance of the position in terms well calculated to win his correspondent's consent. Dr. Wordsworth found a second wife in one of Warden Barter's nieces, and started with her for his new, northern home.

At this point the autobiography comes, for the present, to a halt, but it is followed by nearly a hundred pages consisting of an episode on the Oxford Movement and by English and Latin compositions which secured prizes at Oxford and Harrow. On the Oxford Movement Dr. Wordsworth claims to be

allowed to speak with some authority, owing to his own personal acquaintance with some of its more prominent advocates and to the minute accuracy with which he was kept informed of all that transpired after he had gone down from Oxford. Upon the causes of so many defections to Rome he makes some suggestive comments. He attributes them partly to the youthful inexperience of those by whom the Catholic revival was inaugurated; partly to the conviction which the seceders entertained that they were hopelessly excluded from preferment in the English Church; but principally to a lack of firm grip upon the fundamental principles of the Anglican communion, and to their resort to the study of the fathers in preference to that of our great Anglo-Catholic divines. It is not a little startling to learn from Newman's letters that neither he nor Pusey ever liked the scheme for publishing the Anglo-Catholic Library. Such an admission seems to us equivalent to a renunciation of the Anglican position. It would be well that more of our present-day teachers learned in the pages of Bramhall and Andrewes, of Bull and Hammond, how to grapple with the pretensions of the Papacy and to build up souls in Catholic truth.

The inauguration of Glenalmond closes the period embraced within the present volume. The foundation stone was laid by Sir J. Gladstone (Sept. 8, 1846), and afforded opportunity for the happiest example of Wordsworth's singularly effective epigrammatic power; and at the luncheon which followed, Bishop Russell, without the author's permission, read it to the assembled company:—

'Auctus honore novo,¹ proprio cognomine lætus,
Fundamentum ædis Virque Lapisque jacit.
Quem Lætus-Lapis ipse jacit, lapis omine lætus
Continuò augendus stet, stet, honore novo.

In honours new, for high deserts arrayed,
Gladstone, auspicious name, this basement laid.
Glad stone, laid here by Gladstone's bounteous hand,
Still blest with honours new for ever, ever stand.'

With a few words of further criticism we must conclude our notice of these *Early Annals*. It might be supposed that distance of time would help to place past events in their proper perspective, and that unimportant events would not bulk too largely after the lapse of years. Such a theory would find scant support in Dr. Charles Wordsworth's pages. That

¹ Sir John Gladstone had just received a baronetcy.

his t
suffic
prop
to in
of th
on a
mark
Fren
and
not i
strag
quota
groun
or hi
plime
every
there
the r
time
ness.
writte
a litt
the co
brows
of ver
exqui
scious
lines
be gri
the re
suits v
fidelit
Dr. C
sons.

his book contains much that is of interest, we have already sufficiently shown ; but the reader is wearied by lack of proportion and absence of pruning. The volume is spun out to inordinate length. There is more than ordinary disregard of that artistic effort which ought always to be bestowed on a work designed to describe a scholarly career. It is a marked deficiency in much English, as compared with French, prose literature, that it is essentially inferior in style, and these *Early Annals* suggest that classical scholarship is not incompatible with heaviness in English composition and a straggling invertebrate patchwork of original letterpress and quotation. Nor are these blemishes lamentable on artistic grounds alone. We think the author hardly does himself or his work justice in quoting at so great length the complimentary letters of his wide circle of friends on each and every point of his Winchester life. Surely his own standing there needs no such bolstering as mere acknowledgment of the receipt of a sermon which the recipient has not yet had time to read or commendation in terms of general politeness. Even the quaint conceit of a copy of Latin verses written by his favourite pigs to the absent Warden becomes a little wearisome when the theme is repeated next year by the cows. A lover's 'new found ballad to his mistress' eyebrows,' when prettily turned, may rank as a fair specimen of *vers de société*, but with the memory of that and of the exquisite Latin epitaph upon a first, lost love, we are conscious of some impatience on being presented with a copy of lines addressed to the lady who replaced her. We should be grieved if these redundancies turned readers aside from the record of a life devoted to scholarly and religious pursuits with exemplary purity of purpose and with undeviating fidelity to the guidance and spirit of the Church, of which Dr. Charles Wordsworth has ever been one of the truest sons.

ART. VI.—PATRISTIC EVIDENCE AND THE GOSPEL CHRONOLOGY.

1. *Ordo Sæclorum: a Treatise on the Chronology of the Holy Scriptures.* By HENRY BROWNE, M.A., Principal of the Diocesan College, Chichester. (London, 1844.)
2. *The New Testament in the Original Greek, with Introduction and Appendix.* By B. F. WESTCOTT, D.D., and F. J. A. HORT, D.D. [Note by Dr. HORT on John vi. 4.] (Cambridge and London, 1881.)
3. *Die Pilatus-Acten.* Kritisch untersucht von Professor Dr. R. A. LIPSIVS. Neue vermehrte Ausgabe. (Kiel, 1886.)

OUR readers may not impossibly be inclined on the threshold to ask why, in the list of books prefixed to an article dealing with the chronology of the Gospels, well-known and important treatises, such as those of Wieseler and Caspari in German, or Greswell and Lewin in English, find no place? Assuredly, if our intention had been to review exhaustively the whole bearings of the problem, books like these would have formed an indispensable starting-point. But then nothing of such a sort could have been attempted, much less carried out, within the limits of a Review article; it would have required a treatise to itself. Our present plan is conceived on a much humbler scale, and we do not propose to do more than sketch the general question in outline, and to fill in in detail some few corners only of the canvas. We shall call especial attention to the patristic evidence, and with that view we have named at the head of this article, first, Mr. Browne's *Ordo Sæclorum*, of which the portion we are concerned with would certainly have created more attention from the learned world if it had had the good fortune to have been written in German, and which, considering that it bears a date nearly fifty years back when patristic studies were only beginning to revive among us, appears to us to have some quite remarkable merits; secondly, Dr. Hort's note on John vi. 4 (pp. 77-81 of the Appendix to Westcott and Hort), in which he takes up and develops some of Mr. Browne's conclusions; and, last, a pamphlet of Professor Lipsius devoted to one important fragment of Christian antiquity.

The treatment of the subject which we intend to adopt is to group it round the question of the chronology of Christ's ministry, so that the three points involved are the date of the commencement of the ministry, the length of its duration, and

the moment of its close. Clearly, then, if we can settle any two of these on conclusive evidence, the third can be deduced from them, and even the entire absence of corroborative testimony to it would not vitiate the result. If we know when the ministry began and ended, we know also how long it lasted. If we can prove its duration, then when we fix its end we fix its beginning also, and *vice versâ*. But, in fact, the phenomena are not quite so simple. For no one of the three is there proof capable of being called demonstrative; and yet no one of the three but can command presumptions of varying degrees of probability.

I. We propose for convenience' sake to take the three points in their inverse chronological order, and to start from the independent evidence for the date of the Crucifixion. For this we have as finger-posts (1) the procuratorship of Pilate; (2) the high-priesthood of Caiaphas; (3) the day of the week and of the (Jewish) month; (4) an eclipse said to coincide with the darkness of Matt. xxvii. 45; (5) ecclesiastical tradition as to the (civil) day and month, and to the year, of the Crucifixion.

(1) Pilate's predecessor, Valerius Gratus, was appointed procurator, as we learn from Josephus,¹ by the Emperor Tiberius, and held office for eleven years; and since Tiberius succeeded in August A.D. 14, the earliest date for Pilate's own entry into office is consequently A.D. 25. But we also learn that Pilate spent ten years in Judæa, and reached Rome on his recall just after the death of Tiberius in March A.D. 37. He cannot, therefore, have been governor at any passover earlier than that of A.D. 27, or later than that of A.D. 36.

(2) Caiaphas, whose appointment to the high-priesthood preceded Pilate's tenure of office, was deposed by Vitellius, legate of Syria, at the time of a passover; and as his successor Jonathan was deposed also at a passover—that at which the news of Tiberius's death arrived, obviously that of April A.D. 37—it follows that the passover of Vitellius's visit and Caiaphas's deposition cannot have been later than A.D. 36, nor that of the Crucifixion than A.D. 35.

(3) So far the ground has not been narrowed down to less than a space of nine years, from A.D. 27 to 35. But the Gospels also prove, first, that the day of the Resurrection was a Sunday, and therefore that of the Crucifixion a Friday;²

¹ The references for Pilate are *Antt.* xviii. ii. 2, iv. 2; for Caiaphas, *Antt.* xviii. ii. 2, iv. 3, v. 3.

² Dr. Westcott, in his *Introduction to the Study of the Gospels*, in an Appendix to chapter vi. (ed. 6, p. 348), strangely argues that the day of

and secondly, that the Crucifixion took place at a Passover, although whether on the 14th or 15th of Nisan, whether the Passover by a few hours followed or preceded the Crucifixion, has always been a problem for debate, since St. John appears to imply the former, the Synoptists the latter view. Space forbids our recapitulating here the considerations which induce us, following the most ancient writers,¹ to accept the lucid testimony of the fourth Gospel, and to place the Crucifixion on Nisan 14. But a word may not be out of place upon one decisive argument from history. The Church of the second century was involved in controversy as to the correct time of the Paschal celebration; for the Westerns always observed a fixed day of the week, while the Asiatics claimed St. John's authority for adhering simply to the day of Nisan, the 14th, whence their name of Quartodecimans. The egregious alternative propounded by the Tübingen School, that Christians should have been commemorating, not the Crucifixion, but the Last Supper, would pale in the light of common sense, even if we failed to remember that on the Jewish reckoning, since the day began at six P.M., the Last Supper fell in any case on the same day as the Crucifixion, and if the former on the 14th, then the latter also. Moreover, Christian antiquity is unanimous in seeing in the Crucifixion the exact antitype of the slaying of the paschal lamb on the afternoon of the 14th. Indeed, this interpretation, as well as that which sees in the Resurrection the antitype of the offering of the harvest firstfruits on Nisan 16, may probably claim the sanction of St. Paul.²

But if we know that in the year of the Crucifixion

the Crucifixion was a Thursday, on the ground of the prophecy (Matt. xii. 40) that the Son of Man should be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth. But without dwelling on the unanimous tradition of the Christian Church, surely no light witness—reinforced, as it now is, as far as the Friday fast is concerned, by first-century testimony in the *Didache*—it may suffice to refer to Dr. Field's conclusive note *ad loc.* (*Otium Norvicense*, pars iii. p. 7), where an irresistible mass of quotations is adduced to show that 'the third day' (the usual New Testament phrase to indicate the interval between the Crucifixion and the Resurrection) could to an ancient writer by no possibility mean anything else than 'the day after to-morrow.'

¹ Apollinaris, Clement of Alexandria, Irenæus, Tertullian, Hippolytus. In the fourth century the opposite opinion began to prevail; and Photius (cod. 115, 116), recording the evidence of two anonymous writers for the earlier view, speaks of them as differing from 'Chrysostom and the Church.' Modern critics are equally divided; against the view here taken cf. McClellan, *New Testament*, p. 473; Lewin, *Fasti Sacri*, p. xxxi; Edersheim, *Jesus the Messiah*, xii. 479.

² 1 Cor. v. 8; xv. 20.

Friday fell on the 14th of Nisan—or in the less probable alternative on the 15th—the years open to our choice, which as we have seen were A.D. 27–35, will be essentially limited. We have only to find by astronomical calculation when the full moon of Nisan actually fell in each of these years, to see whether it will suit the condition as to the day of the week. The matter, however, is not so simple as it looks; for we have no absolute certainty in some years as to which month was Nisan, or in any year as to the exact day on which Nisan commenced.

The month Nisan was originally that lunation, before the full moon of which the first ears of barley harvest were ripe (Deut. xvi. 9; Lev. xxiii. 10). When a systematic kalendar succeeded this empiric method, Nisan was properly that month whose full moon fell first after the spring equinox. But we learn from Christian writers of the fourth century that it was a not uncommon thing for the Jews at least of that time to fix their equinox too early, and therefore to put Nisan and the Passover a month too soon; nor is there anything to show that the difficulties of these astronomical calculations were felt in any less degree in the time of Christ. Nay more, if we may suppose the same process to have been already at work which we can trace in Christian times, the equinoctial limit must be pushed further and further back. The Alexandrines of the beginning of the fourth century took March 21 as their equinox; Anatolius of Laodicea, in the last half of the third century, March 19; Hippolytus, in the first half of the same century, the 18th. It must be borne in mind, then, in cases of doubt, that the month of Nisan may possibly have been kept in our Lord's time a month earlier than we should naturally place it ourselves.

Just as the commencement of each year with Nisan, so the commencement of each month with the new moon had been originally fixed by simple observation; and since astronomy will tell us the true time of conjunction for any new moon, and some thirty hours must be added for the crescent to become visible after sunset, it would be possible to calculate when each new month ought to have begun. But even sooner than with the year, purely empiric methods must have been modified by some permanent rules. It would surely have been impossible to keep on with the old month for an extra week simply because every night was cloudy and the moon was not visible. Very soon it must, at least, have been recognized that no month could be less than twenty-nine or more than thirty days. In particular, the month Adar, which preceded Nisan, was at some time or another definitely fixed

to twenty-nine days, so that Nisan might begin rather earlier in relation to the new moon than some other months.

Now keeping these cautions in mind, and comparing the tables given in Salmon (*Introd. N.T.* ch. xvi. Appendix) or McClellan (*N.T.* p. 493), we shall see that neither the 14th nor 15th Nisan could possibly have fallen on Friday in A.D. 28, or 31, or 32, or 35, nor in A.D. 34 earlier than April 23, and this we are clear would be a month too late. In A.D. 27 Friday, April 11, in A.D. 30 Friday, April 7, might have been Nisan 14. In A.D. 33 Friday, April 3, was more probably Nisan 14 than 15. It results that of the nine years in question, five are impossible, three are possible. The remaining year is A.D. 29, and here, if the paschal full moon were correctly given in the authorities as Monday or Tuesday, April 18 or 19, a Friday on either Nisan 14 or 15 is out of the question. But would it not be possible to place Nisan a month earlier? The astronomical full moon in March would seem to have fallen in this year somewhere about the first hours of the morning of the 4th (for the next new moon is calculated to April 2, at 7.30 or 8 p.m.), and remembering that Nisan might begin rather early, it would be quite reasonable to fix on Friday, March 18, as another alternative date for Nisan 14.

(4) The historian Phlegon mentioned, under the fourth year of the 202nd Olympiad, a very remarkable eclipse of the sun, such that it became night at midday, and (apparently at the same time) an earthquake which overthrew the greater part of Nicæa.¹ Those writers who, like Origen in his treatise against Celsus, and Eusebius in his *Chronicle*, identified this with the darkness of the Crucifixion, would obviously, if they had occasion to do so, have drawn—as Eusebius does draw—the deduction that the Crucifixion belongs to that year, the 19th of Tiberius, or A.D. 32. But Julius Africanus, the Christian chronographer of the beginning of the third century, had already shown that the identification was impossible, since eclipses of the sun cannot take place at full moon, and Origen in his commentary on St. Matthew (an almost contemporary work with the *Contra Celsum*) follows Africanus in asserting that the darkness must have been miraculous. There are difficulties in settling what exactly it was that Phlegon said, but since his testimony is only of interest as having suggested a false date to Eusebius and others, we may at once pass on to our last point.²

¹ Lipsius, *Filatus-Acten*, p. 23.

² Lewin, p. xlii, argues that there was no natural eclipse of the sun in

A.D.
exce
if we
help
(
tion

(Pse

Juliu

by th

sosto

the

there

'som

Chro

the

Pilat

on M

Fin

fixin

Apri

prob

the C

ness

prop

that

when

error

ough

true

ther

exan

ing t

that y

gelist

corre

Chris

that l

Light

Civ.

Chry

Lact

Chro

Potte

Acten

(5) Between April 11, A.D. 27, March 18, A.D. 29, April 7, A.D. 30, April 3, A.D. 33, all of which seem to be Nisan 14, except the last, which is either the 14th or 15th, we have now, if we can, to choose, and to choose in the first place with the help of ancient traditions of Christian writers—

(a) What days then are given in early Christian tradition?

March 25 is given for the Crucifixion by Hippolytus, (Pseudo-) Tertullian, the Liberian Chronicler of A.D. 354, by Julius Hilarianus, and by Augustine, in the West: in the East by the Acts of Pilate, by a Paschal Homily of (Pseudo-) Chrysostom in A.D. 387, and by an Egyptian system inserted in the Paschal Chronicle; March 23 for the Crucifixion (and therefore March 25 for the Resurrection) by Lactantius, by 'some' persons according to Epiphanius, and by the Paschal Chronicler himself. March 20 is Epiphanius's own date for the Crucifixion, while he alludes to copies of the Acts of Pilate which he had found, where the Crucifixion was placed on March 18; this would place the Resurrection on March 20. Finally, Basilidians are quoted by Clement of Alexandria as fixing on March 21, and others of them on April 14 or April 20.¹ Now March 25 (with which the 23rd is not improbably connected, as though the 25th were the date not for the Crucifixion, but for the Resurrection) is among extant witnesses first testified to by Hippolytus, and Dr. Salmon has proposed the view that this day was originally due to the fact that March 25 was the true full moon in A.D. 221, at the time when Hippolytus was preparing his system, so that on his erroneous cycle of sixteen years, the full moon of A.D. 29 ought to have fallen on the same day. But March 18 was the true full moon in A.D. 29, as we have already seen, and it is therefore at once a striking phenomenon which demands examination that March 18 was the date actually given, according to Epiphanius, by manuscripts he had seen of the *Acta*

that year, and that therefore Phlegon confirms independently the Evangelists' statement of a miraculous darkness. But even if the premiss be correct, since Phlegon obviously had access, directly or indirectly, to Christian sources (cf. Origen, *contra Celsum*, ii. 14), it is not impossible that his information ultimately rests on the Gospels themselves.

¹ Cf. Hippolytus, *Chronicle*; Ps.-Tert. *adv. Jud.* 8; Chron. Lib. in Lightfoot's *Clement*, i. 253; Julius Hilar. quoted by Hort, p. 79; Aug. *Civ. Dei*, xviii. 54; *Acta Pilati* in Tischendorf's *Apocrypha*, p. 204; Chrysostom, ed. Savile, v. 940; *Paschal Chronicle*, ed. Dufresne, p. 225; Lactantius, *Div. Inst.* iv. 15; *ἡμερ. ap. Epiph.* *Hær.* 50. 1; *Pasch. Chron.* p. 221; *Epiph. Hær.* 50. 1, 51. 23; Clem. Alex. *Strom.* i. 147, ed. Potter, p. 408. Many of these references we owe to Lipsius, *Pilatus-Acten*, p. 27.

Pilati. Is this then an accidental coincidence or a fragmentary survival of genuine tradition?

The introductory historical notice in the extant Acts is as follows:—

‘In the fifteenth (*v.l.* nineteenth) year of the rule of Tiberius Cæsar, King of the Romans, and of Herod, King of Judæa, in the nineteenth year of his reign, on the eighth before the kalends of April, which is the 25th of March, in the consulship of Rufus and Rubellio, in the fourth year of the two hundred and second Olympiad, in the high-priesthood of Joseph the Caiaphas,’ &c. (Lipsius, p. 21, n.)

There can be no doubt that as this now stands it is posterior to and dependent on Eusebius, for the years of Herod and of the Olympiads are indubitably taken from his *Chronicle*, and similarly the *varia lectio* of the ‘nineteenth’ year of Tiberius. But it is equally certain that there are elements in it both independent of and contradictory to the system of Eusebius: such are the consulship of Rufus and Rubellio, the two Gemini (=A.D. 29), and if genuine the ‘fifteenth’ year of Tiberius. We have not space here to argue out the question whether Lipsius is right in postponing the composition of these Acts to the fourth century: it is enough for our purpose to say that if the author was not early himself he must certainly have made use of early material. But all that we are at this moment directly concerned with are the various readings, March 18 or 25. The latter is supported by (1) all existing manuscripts and versions; (2) the *Quartodecimans* against whose deduction from these Acts Epiphanius is arguing; (3) the Paschal Homily of Pseudo-Chrysostom in A.D. 387, who accepts the date of March 25 on the authority of the Acts. Against this we can only set the *antigrapha* which Epiphanius (c. 375 A.D.) had found. External evidence is not favourable to the 18th; but, on the other hand, if the alteration was an intentional one, the unusual March 18 (a date, too, which would have seemed impossibly early for the 14th Nisan to the Christians of the fourth century) was much more likely to have been assimilated to the prevalent March 25 than *vice versâ*. It would seem that the choice must lie between the hypothesis of an accidental corruption of the H’ before the Kalends of March (March 25) into the IE’ (March 18)—a corruption certainly not impossible—and the hypothesis that the earlier date represents the original text, though now only guaranteed to us by the statement of Epiphanius. And if anything more than a mere accidental corruption, the very fact that it is too early a day for Nisan 14, according to the later computators,

show
age
14th
super
But
and
answ
not
been
equi
leli
Red
creat
grou
whic
Apo
comp
see t
A.D.
Marc
thew
more
But
to fe
scrib
tuito
tion
tradi
(
write
for al
their
this v
feren
shall
the f
the C
of Ti
the r
only
we sh
T
in the
sulsh
is ant

shows that it must mount back at least into the ante-Nicene age ; for the system of Hippolytus, the only one in which the 14th of the Paschal moon could fall as early as March 18, was superseded in the East before the end of the third century. But we should still ask why this particular day was fixed on, and to this question there would seem to be only two tenable answers : although it might intelligibly be urged that we are not called upon to explain such vagaries at all. It may have been that some theorist, taking March 18 as the date of the equinox, and therefore, also, according to a common parallelism, of the creation of the world, thought it fit that the Redemption of the world should fall upon the same day as its creation, and the belief would then rest entirely on *à priori* grounds. It may also have been that it represents a tradition which, by channels unknown to us, did survive from the Apostolic to a later age, and reappears to our sight in this composite document of the *Acts of Pilate*. Since we shall see that there are weighty arguments for adopting the year A.D. 29 as that of the Crucifixion, then, since we know that March 18 is the only conceivable Friday Nisan 14 of that year, the witness of the *Acta* acquires some confirmation, and becomes more probable than we should otherwise be inclined to allow. But taken by itself, too many alternatives are possible for us to feel compelled to accept the testimony. It may be a scribe's unintentional corruption ; it may be a romancer's fortuitous precision ; it may be a theorist's parallelism of creation and redemption ; it may also possibly be a genuine tradition.

(b) We proceed to the more tangible evidence of the early writers to the year of the Crucifixion, and we put aside once for all those systems which have no ante-Nicene evidence at their back. If Eusebius selects the nineteenth year of Tiberius, this was partly, as we have seen, owing to his erroneous inferences from Phlegon, partly owing to his reckoning (as we shall see) as many as four passovers in St. John's Gospel after the fifteenth year of Tiberius. Again, if Jerome's version of the Chronicle alters Eusebius' nineteenth into the eighteenth of Tiberius, this was because he reckoned one passover less to the ministry. All such evidence is, therefore, really in place only in the discussion on the duration of the ministry, and we shall reserve it till we reach that point.

The case is different with those who place the Crucifixion in the fifteenth or sixteenth year of Tiberius, or in the consulship of the two Gemini (A.D. 29) ; for, in the first place, there is ante-Nicene evidence for each of these statements ; and in

the second, whatever their origin, they cannot be mere deductions from the text of the Gospels as we have them. On both grounds, then, they demand investigation at this point.

The consulship of the two Gemini, Rufus and Rubellius, is given alone by the Liberian Chronicler of A.D. 354, by Sulpicius Severus (A.D. 400), and by St. Augustine; and, together with the 'fifteenth year of Tiberius,' by Prosper, Lactantius, and (Pseudo-)Tertullian, as well as (in all probability) by the *Acta Pilati*. The second date, the 'fifteenth year of Tiberius,' is given alone by Clement of Alexandria, and by Julius Africanus as represented in the Latin of Jerome; while the same author, in the Greek of Eusebius, is made to say the 'sixteenth year,' and this latter is also the date given by the pseudo-Cyprianic paschal computation of A.D. 243. And, finally, the year A.D. 29 is supported by Hippolytus, and by the legend of Abgarus of Edessa.¹

Now, of these statements, those that refer to the 'sixteenth year' may very possibly be a combination of St. Luke iii. 1 (the Baptist's ministry in the fifteenth year), with the doubtless erroneous belief (with which we shall have presently to deal) that the ministry of Christ lasted no more than a year. But of the authors quoted this only applies to Pseudo-Cyprian, for it seems more likely that the text of Africanus should have been altered from 'fifteenth' to 'sixteenth' than *vice versâ*, just because the fifteenth year for the Passion seems *prima facie* to contradict St. Luke, for no one reckoned the ministry at less than a year, and therefore it appeared that the Crucifixion must be postponed to the sixteenth. We have, then, several early and important writers who, in apparent contradiction to the Gospel text, and therefore, of course, following some theory or tradition independent of it, agree on the fifteenth year. Can we say why? It might be possible to maintain that the starting-point was the belief, certainly expressed by some fathers (e.g. by Hippolytus and Clement of Alexandria), that Christ was only thirty years of age when He suffered, and that the Passion falls, therefore, in the same year as the Baptism (Luke iii. 23 compared with iii. 1). But we are inclined to adopt the converse as more probable, and take the 'fifteenth year' for the Passion as the starting-point for the 'thirty years;' and the fifteenth year, in turn, is probably

¹ The references are mainly as before, adding Sulp. Sev. *Hist. Sac.* ii. 40; Prosper, *Chronicle*; Hieron. in *Dan.* ix. 27 (ed. Bened. iii. 1110); Eus. *Dem. Ev.* viii. (ed. Paris, A.D. 1628, pp. 389-90); Abgar in Eus. *H. E.* i. 13 (year of the Greeks 340 = September A.D. 28 to September A.D. 29). Cf. for most of them, Browne, *Ordo Saeculorum*, p. 73 sq.

derived from—at any rate is in full agreement with—the mention of the consulship of the two Gemini in A.D. 29.

For the years of Tiberius might be variously reckoned. He succeeded Augustus in the August of A.D. 14, and his fifteenth year will run from August A.D. 28 to August A.D. 29, so that on the strict reckoning the Passover which belongs to the fifteenth year, will be that of A.D. 29 in the consulship of the Gemini. But the method of adjustment between the imperial and consular years (which were the same as our own, from January 1 to December 31) might perhaps be the complete assimilation of the former to the latter, so that a fresh year of Tiberius would begin on January 1, A.D. 15. But would such a year be called the first or the second? would the fraction of the previous year count as a whole one, or be neglected altogether? In favour of the first alternative might be urged the parallel instance of the emperors, from Trajan onwards, who started a fresh year of tribunician power on the annual day of the inauguration of the ordinary tribunes, so that any previous fraction of a year of office counted as a whole one.¹ In favour of the latter would be the practice of a chronographer like Eusebius who, in constructing a continuous chronology, could not, for instance, reckon A.D. 14 both as the fifty-sixth of Augustus and the first of Tiberius, and therefore postpones the first of Tiberius to A.D. 15. On these lines the fifteenth year, while strictly from August A.D. 28 to August A.D. 29, might be reckoned as equivalent simply either to A.D. 28 or to A.D. 29; and thus the consuls of A.D. 29 might be considered those of the fifteenth or of the sixteenth year. So far, then, we are led to state tentatively the hypothesis that the chronological notices of the Passion in the earliest writers rest ultimately on the mention of the consulship of the two Gemini, and we can see no reason at all why this may not have been actually handed down by tradition from the Apostolic age. The year was one of those which we saw to be astronomically possible, and the conclusion is strengthened by the coincidence of the mention of the true day for Nisan 14 of that year in Epiphanius' manuscripts of the *Acts of Pilate*. But of course the whole is no more than an hypothesis to be tested by its agreement or disagreement with the best results attainable from other lines of inquiry. Explanations which have seemed at the moment less probable in themselves, may acquire a high degree of likelihood from comparison with further evidence; and it would be conceivable that we might have in the end to conclude that all refer-

¹ Lightfoot's *Ignatius* (ed. 1), ii. 398.

ences to the consulship of the Gemini are references to the fifteenth year of Tiberius, and these, again, references to the thirty years of age, as a number interpreted mystically to be especially fitting for the Passion.

To sum up, astronomical considerations limited us to the choice of the years 27, 29, 30, 33 A.D. All such patristic evidence as is worth a moment's consideration is in favour of A.D. 29: *prima facie* the weight of this is considerable, and if consonant with other results would reinforce them strongly. But it would be also open to us to explain it away, and ultimate conclusions will not be reached until we have discussed both the length of the ministry, and the date of its commencement with the baptism.

II. The second problem which faces us is the duration of Christ's public ministry, or the interval between the Baptism and the Crucifixion: and here we propose to speak first of the text and exegesis of the Gospels, and then of the traditions or calculations of early Christian writers.

It is undeniable that the Synoptic account, taken by itself, would support the hypothesis that the ministry was of no considerable length; and that view, widely prevalent, as we shall see, in some of the earliest Christian generations, may well have derived its origin and its strength in a period and in circles in which only these and similar Gospels were accessible. But the extant text of the Gospel of St. John mentions at least three, if not four, Passovers (including that of the Crucifixion) in the course of Christ's ministry; so that we have a minimum of two complete years for the ministry, with the fractional interval between the Baptism and the first Passover to be in any case added in. Before, however, we can profitably descend to the discussion of this Gospel in detail, we must clear the ground as far as we can by facing the preliminary but crucial question whether this minimum is also a maximum; in other words, whether we can assume that St. John's enumeration of feasts, and particularly of Passovers, is at least approximately exhaustive.

It is notorious that one Father, Irenæus, perhaps the most favourably placed of all for gathering up and recording for posterity the beliefs of the apostolic and sub-apostolic age, boldly claims that Christ, having begun His ministry about the age of thirty, continued teaching until He had passed the age of forty, and was not far from that of fifty.¹ The claim is supported, on *à priori* grounds, for Christ came to save and sanctify every time of life, and, therefore, age as well as youth;

¹ Irenæus, II. xxii. 4, *sqq.*; and lower down, Iren. v. xxxiii. 3.

on so
years
if He
'The
ancie
the d
this
scarc
'unde
be da
A.D. 3
years
of Ir
years
then,
ing t
Johan
to an
is ma
Lord,
and c
work
it is a
of an
author
exege
(as E
worth
ever t
but it
on wh
this in
that w
narrow
fifty y
W
some
contra
Papias
to the
and th
tion, w
serve a
entitled
the syn
VOL.

on scripture, for the Jews asserted that He was not yet fifty years old, and could not therefore have seen Abraham, while if He had still been under forty they would of course have said 'Thou art not yet forty years old;' and very emphatically on ancient testimony, for 'so all the elders who had known John the disciple of the Lord in Asia witness, that he gave them this tradition.' Now, since our Lord, as we shall see, can scarcely have been born earlier than 6 B.C., and His death, 'under Pontius Pilate,' cannot with any shadow of probability be dated later than A.D. 33, and by no possibility later than A.D. 35, the extreme period of His life does not exceed forty years; and even this is not enough to satisfy the whole scope of Irenæus' argument, which postulates an age of over forty years at least some months before the Crucifixion. Is there, then, any explanation which would be capable of counteracting the effect of the apparently conclusive appeal to the Johannine tradition of Asia Minor? It is natural to turn to another passage of Irenæus, where a similar appeal is made to the 'elders who saw John the disciple of the Lord,' particularized later on as 'Papias, a hearer of John and companion of Polycarp;' and as we know that Papias' work was primarily a commentary on sayings of the Gospels, it is a legitimate inference, when we find a particular exegesis of an evangelic text side by side with emphasis again on the authority of the 'elders,' that here too the authority and the exegesis is that of Papias. But was Papias, the unintelligent (as Eusebius calls him), likely to prove in all cases a trustworthy guide? True, he must have had access, closed for ever to us, to many an apostolic tradition of priceless value; but it is equally true that there must have been many things on which his notions were self-evolved, and if it were so in this instance, there is every reason in the world to suppose that with his literalist temper he would have pressed to its narrowest meaning the *à fortiori* argument, 'Thou art not yet fifty years old,' of the Jewish controversialists.

We conclude, then, that the hypothesis of a ministry of some fifteen years, as formulated by St. Irenæus, is directly contrary to the evidence, and easily explicable as a freak of Papias, who can have had little claim, save that of antiquity, to the exaggerated deference with which Irenæus treats him; and the approach is left unencumbered to our original question, whether St. John's enumeration of feasts is sufficient to serve as a practical guide to a certain chronology. We are entitled to assume that St. John wrote with one or more of the synoptic forms of narrative before him; and considering

that one of the most obvious and considerable differences between the story as told by them and by him consists in these very notes of time which in his account mark the narrative off into stages, it is difficult not to believe that the chronology is purposely introduced with the aim of correcting emphatically, but silently (in St. John's way), the erroneous impression which might be derived—nay, it is likely enough, had been already derived—as to the duration of the ministry from the looser synoptic account. And if so, the intention of the evangelist would surely not have been attained, unless his own gospel substituted at least an approximate idea of the truth. Tentatively then, and with full appreciation of the chance of an altered balance of probabilities by other evidence, we shall decide that St. John's Gospel provides us with material for fixing the actual length of Christ's ministry.¹

It will be convenient to enumerate at this point the notes of time contained in this Gospel between the Baptism and the Crucifixion:—

Ch. ii. 13, 'the passover of the Jews was nigh'; ii. 23, 'he was in Jerusalem at the passover at the feast.'

Ch. iv. 35, 'say ye not, there is yet a four months' period, and harvest cometh? behold I say unto you, lift up your eyes and look on the fields, for they are white to harvest.'

Ch. v. 1, 'after these things was a feast' [*v. l.* the feast] of the Jews, and Jesus went up to Jerusalem.'

Ch. vi. 4, 'and the passover the feast of the Jews was nigh.'

Ch. vii. 2, 'and the feast of the Jews, the tabernacles, was nigh.'

Ch. x. 22, 'at that time fell the feast of the dedication at Jerusalem.'

Ch. xi. 55, 'and the passover of the Jews was nigh.'

Of the Passovers here mentioned the last is that of the Crucifixion, and the first is also an undoubted case; so that at the lowest the ministry must have covered a year and something more. If the extant text be followed another Passover is mentioned in vi. 4, and another year added to the ministry. But Dr. Hort, following out a line of argument initiated by Mr. Browne,² suspects wide-spread corruption here, and, omitting the words τὸ πᾶσχα altogether, would transfer the reference of 'the feast' from the Passover to the Tabernacles of vii. 2. No doubt if this could be done the chrono-

¹ This consideration appears to be overlooked by writers who, like Lewin (*Fasti*, p. xlv), insert other Passovers which they believe are postulated by St. Luke's Gospel. No reliance can really be placed on the observance of chronological order by the third Synoptist.

² Browne, *Ordo Saeculorum*, p. 84 sqq.; Hort, *ad loc.* (Appendix, p. 77 sqq.).

nological problem would in some ways be materially simplified, for the feasts would run : Passover (ch. ii.), Pentecost or Trumpets (ch. v.), Tabernacles (ch. vii.), Dedication (ch. x.), Passover (ch. xiii.), and the whole would be comprised within a period of a year, in harmony with the apparent evidence of the other Gospels. The considerations which affect the question must be set forth in some detail.

It is conjectured that the words doubted were the insertion of some very early scribe to define the allusion of 'the feast,' while the Talmud is quoted as showing that to a Jew 'the feast' could only mean that of Tabernacles. But if St. John was a Jew, he was writing as an apostle for Christian converts, and converts no doubt mainly of Gentile parentage. To them the feasts, indeed, of Passover and of Pentecost were of living interest, for each synchronized with the commemoration of a great fact of the Christian faith ; but the feast of Tabernacles, on the contrary, can have had in their eyes no importance whatever ; so that all that seems to be proved is that St. John is in the highest degree unlikely to have used so ambiguous a phrase without explanation.

But, further, certain ancient witnesses—Irenæus, Origen, Cyril of Alexandria, and the Alogi—are called to bear positive evidence to the absence of the defining words from their copies.

IRENÆUS, against the limitation of the ministry to a single year, draws attention to St. John's mention of Christ's visits to Jerusalem to keep the Passover ; and while he interprets the unnamed feast of v. 1 to be a Passover, he passes over vi. 4 entirely without notice. But this much may be said in answer, that his proof is definitely based on visits to Jerusalem, and no mention of any such visit accompanies the notice of the Passover in question.¹ And the same consideration applies to the evidence of those heretics, whom, because of their rejection of St. John's Gospel, Epiphanius, our sole authority for what concerns them, nicknamed ALOGI. Among their reasons for criticizing the Gospel was that it said 'that the Saviour observed (πεποιήκεναι) two Passovers in a period of two years, while the other evangelists speak of one Passover ;' and Epiphanius criticizes them in turn for not recognizing that there are not only two but three Passovers in the Gospels.² But here, again, their statement was strictly true : St. John does not tell us of more than two Passovers being 'observed'

¹ Irenæus, II. xxii. 3, esp. the words 'quoties secundum tempus Paschæ Dominus ascenderit in Hierusalem.'

² Epiph. *Har.* li. 22.

in the course of the ministry by visits to Jerusalem. ORIGEN, on John iv. 35¹ (his commentary is defective for cc. v.-vii.), urges that the feast of v. 1 cannot have been a Passover, for shortly afterwards the statement occurs 'the feast of the Jews the tabernacles was nigh;' so that the intervening phrase in vi. 4, 'the Passover was nigh,' must either have been overlooked by him or cannot have stood in that shape in his copy of the Gospel. But difficult as it may be to suppose that a note of time so clear, although parenthetical, escaped the eye of Origen, the alternative is no easier; for whatever his reading in vi. 4—whether or no τὸ πάσχα was omitted or even replaced by ἡ σκηνοπηγία—the order of the words proves that what Origen is quoting is ch. vii. 2, while his argument required him to adduce the very first chronological reference after v. 1. Either then he made a slip or quoted from memory, or else his text must have lacked vi. 4 altogether, and cannot be brought as a witness to its true reading. Lastly, CYRIL of Alexandria on John vi., while in the text as printed² he twice quotes ver. 4 as 'the Passover of the Jews was nigh,' goes on in the succeeding paragraphs to discuss the feast of Tabernacles, and it is suggested that the words τὸ πάσχα were in both instances a scribe's correction. But even if so, that some deduction, at any rate, must be made before Cyril's clear-headedness on this sort of chronological question is admitted, a comparison of his comments on iv. 35 and v. 1 will suffice to show; for the first passage he interprets to mean that the season was winter, and almost immediately after he deduces from the second the result that the whole interval between ii. 23 and v. 1 was only that between Passover and Pentecost, or fifty days of spring.

We are not of opinion, then, that the patristic evidence adduced by Dr. Hort and Mr. Browne comes to very much. But the omission of the words τὸ πάσχα in the few texts of which we have been speaking, even if established, could be easily enough explained. Many early writers, we shall see, on grounds as we believe quite independent of the Fourth Gospel, attributed to our Lord's ministry a duration of no more than a year. When confronted with the contrary testimony of St. John, some might withdraw their original thesis, some might prefer to leave the contradiction unsolved; but here and there a scribe might be found rash enough, by the

¹ Orig. ed. Delarue, iv. 248.

² Cyril in *Joann.* ed. Pusey, p. 398; and cf. pp. 295, 305. Mr. Pusey had two independent MSS., one of the twelfth, one of the fifteenth century.

omission of these two words, to bring St. John's text into harmony with what he conceived to be the ancient and apostolic tradition.

On the other side, it may be said that no single extant manuscript of the Greek Testament, no known evidence of any Version, supports the omission of the words. Nor is it in itself likely that a feast could be referred to in vi. 4 as already 'near,' and that then, after the continuous action of vii. 1 had intervened ('after these things Jesus was walking in Galilee'), the same feast should be again described in the same terms as still only 'near.' And on a review of the evidence as a whole, there is scarcely room for hesitation in asserting the conviction that the words doubted are from no other pen than the Evangelist's, and that the third Passover must be added to the Gospel account of the ministry.

This conclusion being established, the chronology of the latter chapters presents no difficulty. In vi. 4 a Passover is at hand, and the season therefore spring; the feast of Tabernacles fixes chapter vii. to autumn; the Dedication belongs to winter; and finally, the last Passover brings us round to spring again: so that in the chapters from the sixth onwards are represented the events of exactly one year. But are we to say that the earlier chapters, from the Passover of ii. 23 to the Passover of vi. 4, represent one year or two?

In chapter v. 1, 'after these things was a feast [or 'the feast'] of the Jews,' the definite article is found in *8C.*, the Egyptian versions, and Cyril of Alexandria; and if Tischendorf were right in adopting this reading, we should find ourselves facing the same difficulty as to the reference of 'the feast' which has already met us in discussing Hort's views on vi. 4. But the external evidence for the omission of the article is overwhelming. *ABD*, Origen, Chrysostom, and Epiphanius are followed by all modern critical editors with the one exception noticed. Assuming, then, that 'a feast' is the original, and 'the feast' the corruption, St. John will not have intended the Passover, which is elsewhere always characterized by name;¹ but, on the other hand, the insertion of the article may easily have been prompted by a desire to define the occasion more exactly, and in consequence have suggested or supported the introduction into the ministry of yet another Passover, making a total of four—a duration of three years and over. It is not necessary for our purpose to attempt to decide what feast, not the Passover, is referred to. Between

¹ John ii. 13, 23, vi. 4, xi. 55. For the opposite view cf. *Greswell's Dissertations upon a Harmony of the Gospels*, ii. 237 f.

the second and sixth chapters the space of a whole year intervenes, in which the only note of time, besides the unnamed feast, is chap. iv. 35, which may have been spoken at actual harvest in April or May, or at actual seedtime in December or January. In the former case we have eleven months open to us in which to locate chap. v., and the feast may have been any one from Pentecost round to Purim; in the latter three months only are open, and the feast must have been that of Purim.

Hitherto our investigations have adhered strictly to the text of St. John's Gospel, save in so far as the theory of Irenæus was, as a preliminary step, discussed and rejected, and we have decided without much hesitation that it contains the mention of three Passovers and three only, so that the minimum—and probably also the maximum—length of the ministry was between two and three years. It is time to turn, as we promised, to the evidence of Christian antiquity, that we may ask (as we asked about the date of the Crucifixion) whether any traces are visible in its remains of traditions independent of the written Gospels.

(a) Let us first take the view which fixed the ministry at between three and four years, not because it is the earliest or the most important, but just because the ground can be speedily cleared of it; for we know the date at which it was formulated, the writer who popularized it, and the reasons he alleged. It does not mount back beyond the fourth century; it owed its prevalence to the reputation of Eusebius as a chronologer; and it rests on a wholly insufficient basis.

In his *History*¹ Eusebius argues that Christ's ministry fell under Annas and Caiaphas, and must have extended therefore over the rule of the three intermediate high priests named by Josephus—Ismael, Eleazar, and Simon—who appear to have held office on the average about a year each. Therefore the ministry—the proof does not, of course, affect more than its minimum duration—extends over 'a period of four years not quite complete.' In his *Demonstratio Evangelica* he deduces from the prophecy of Daniel ix. 27 a three and a half years' ministry as the half-week at the end of which the sacrifice and oblation should cease. In his *Chronicle* he relies primarily on Phlegon's eclipse of Ol. 202,4 (= A.D. 32, 33) for the termination of the ministry, but adduces St. Luke's fifteenth year of Tiberius (= A.D. 29) with St. John's three years following as producing the same result. And of these

¹ Eusebius, *H. E.* i. 10; *D. E.* viii. p. 400; *Chron.*, ed. Schoene, pp. 148, 149.

argu
pries
an as
usele
of th
(
wide
that
limit
opin
and
Hilar
late
insta
befor
he a
Nativ
below
it wa
too,
Whe
Paul
ment
place
whole
devel
perio
many
them
mont
tion,
the m
and t
the tw
M
testim
an in
deduc

¹ E
excix.
quadr
minus
sunt r
passus
² H
Iren. i.

arguments, the first is founded on a misinterpretation of 'the priesthood of Annas and Caiaphas' in Luke iii. 1, the last on an astronomical blunder; and, what is enough to render them useless for our purpose, none of them appeal to any tradition of the Church.

(b) At the other extreme is the belief, apparently more widely spread the further we ascend towards the Apostolic age, that the public ministry of Christ did not extend beyond the limits of a year. As late as the fourth and fifth centuries this opinion found supporters in the West, among them Philastrius and Gaudentius (the two successive bishops of Brescia), Julius Hilarianus, and perhaps Augustine himself.¹ Testimony so late would be valueless if unsupported, but at least four instances of the same chronological system can be quoted before the middle of the third century.² Hippolytus, when he allowed an interval of only thirty years between the Nativity and the Passion, must have reduced the ministry below a year, and so expressly Clement of Alexandria, 'that it was right that He should preach for one year only; this, too, is written thus, "the acceptable year of the Lord."' When St. Peter, in the Clementine Homilies, is attacking St. Paul under the transparent veil of Simon Magus, the argument is pressed that the vision of a single hour cannot be placed in the balance against the familiar intercourse of a whole year. Finally the Gnostics, against whom Irenæus developed his theory of a ministry protracted through a long period of years, had made the thirty æons antitypes of as many years of Christ's silence; while the first eighteen of them, the Ogdoad and Decad, were typified by eighteen months spent by Christ with the disciples after the Resurrection, the other twelve or Dodecad by the twelve months of the ministry (for which also they quoted the 'acceptable year'), and the 'passion' of the last of them by Christ's passion in the twelfth month.

Must we conclude that an opinion as widespread as the testimonies just reviewed show this to have been, represents an independent, ancient, and genuine tradition, or even a deduction from a then current text of St. John? It is certain

¹ But the passage adduced by Dr. Hort is not quite conclusive: *Ep.* cxcix. 20, 'a nativitate autem domini hodie computentur anni ferme quadringenti viginti, a resurrectione autem vel ascensione eius anni plus minus cccxc, ac per hoc si ex quo natus est computetur, septuaginta sunt reliqui [he is speaking of a total period of 490 years], si ex quo passus est, *circa* centum remaneant.'

² Hipp. *Chronicle*; Clem. Al. *Strom.* i. 407; Clem. *Hom.* xvii. 19; Iren. i. iii. 1, 2, ii. xx. 1, xxi. 2.

that Gnostics were the first in Christian or quasi-Christian circles to develop a science of numbers and their interpretations, and chronologists like Hippolytus and others would probably not be too curious in appraising the source and value of such material as came in their way. If we find then, as we do, that the Valentinians, quoted by Irenæus, and the Judæo-Christian Gnostics of the Clementines are the earliest witnesses to this theory, it will not be straining the probabilities if we suppose that they were also its source, and the contradiction to St. John's Gospel is more easily intelligible in circles external to the Church. But even when thus conditioned the question of the ultimate bases of the theory is worth asking. Is it merely a forced exegesis of the prophecy of the acceptable year of the Lord quoted by St. Luke? or is it conceivably a combination of the traditional date for the Passion, the consulship of the Gemini (=A.D. 29), with the fifteenth year of Tiberius, interpreted as A.D. 28? In either case, whether as a supposed critical inference or as arithmetical allegorizing at random, it cannot stand against the positive evidence of St. John's Gospel. The alternative that it represents the genuine Apostolic tradition, by which the statements of the Fourth Gospel should be corrected, is absolutely inadmissible. Whether or no it is likely in the case of the year of the Passion, it is not in the least likely that the length of the ministry should have been handed down in channels independent of the written Gospels.

(c) Nor must it be forgotten that what we have shown to be the certain account of St. John is itself supported by weighty testimony among the Fathers. Melito,¹ in the second century (if we may follow Lightfoot in accepting the fragment quoted by Anastasius Sinaita), contrasts the thirty years before the Baptism with the three (*τρεῖς*) which succeeded it; for, according to the ordinary ancient usage, a *τρεῖς* will mean a period of between two and three years, and not the three to four years which Eusebius and his followers introduced. In the fourth century we need only name Epiphanius, Apollinaris of Laodicea, and Jerome; and, since we learn the last Father's independent belief from his other works, we can now understand that the variation for the year of the Passion in the Chronicle of Eusebius between Jerome (18 Tiberius) and the other authorities (19 Tiberius) is due to deliberate alteration by the Latin translator to suit his own views. Especially noteworthy, however, is the progressive testimony of Origen

¹ Melito, *Fr.* vi.; Epiph. *Hær.* li. 23; Apollinaris ap. Hieron. in *Dan.*; Hieron. in *Esaiam* xxix. 1. Cf. Pseudo-Ignatius, *ad Trall.* x.

in writings of various periods of his life. Commenting on Leviticus, he says that 'Christ was a whole year with the people, that year' of which the prophet spoke as the 'acceptable year of the Lord.' In the *De Principiis*, obviously attempting to combine elements of both views, he speaks of a year and some months. On St. Luke iv. 19 he has this remarkable passage, strangely quoted by Dr. Hort, without qualification, for the single year:—

"The acceptable year of the Lord." In the simple meaning they say that the Saviour preached the Gospel for one year in Judæa, and that this is what is meant. . . . Unless maybe the divine word signifies something of a mystery in the preaching of the year of the Lord. For there shall be other days not such as we now see in the world, and other months, and a different order of kalends (*kalend-arum ordo diversus*). Just then as these shall be other, so there shall be a year of the Lord that shall please him.'

In the much later commentary on St. Matthew (xxiv. 15) in a passage which, if intricate, is not correctly described by Dr. Hort as 'very difficult and confused,' the 'week' of Daniel is interpreted as the seventy years between the birth of Christ and the destruction of Jerusalem. But what is the 'midst of the week,' when sacrifice and oblation should cease? It was about forty years, Phlegon tells us, from the fifteenth year of Tiberius (*i.e.* from the commencement of the ministry) to the destruction. 'Deduct then nearly three years of the Lord's preaching, and the time of the Resurrection, when He appeared to them *per dies quadraginta* (*δι' ἡμερῶν τεσσαράκοντα*), and taught them concerning the kingdom of God, and you will find it more or less exact.' The half-week of thirty-five years begins with the Ascension, and therefore five years 'more or less' must elapse between that and the Baptism, of which 'nearly three' belong to the ministry, and some two years remain over for the 'time of the Resurrection.' We follow Mr. Browne in supposing that Origen, with others of the ancients, interpreted the preposition *διὰ* at intervals of forty days, though we think it much more likely that he reckoned this period of Resurrection appearances, not with Eusebius at three and a half years, but with the Gnostics of Irenæus and the Ascension of Isaiah at eighteen months. Lastly, in his equally late *Contra Celsum*, in answer to the presumption in disfavour of Christ drawn from the faithlessness of his disciple, he adduces the parallel of Aristotle's desertion of Plato, 'although Aristotle is said to have attended Plato for twenty years . . . but Judas lived with Jesus for not so much as three.'

To sum up the results of the second division of our inquiry, the length of the ministry has been shown to be, according to St. John's Gospel, not less than between two and three years; but probably also not more, for considerations of the Evangelist's motive in introducing notes of time into his Gospel at all led us to believe that they were meant to be exhaustive; and it may be added here that every year added to the ministry would seriously increase the difficulty of harmonizing the synoptic account, and the impression which has in fact been produced by it, with the fuller narrative of St. John. The patristic evidence, however, late and weak for a ministry of over three years, earlier and stronger for between two and three years, in accord with the best exegesis of the Gospel, was strongest and earliest of all for a limitation to one year, such as we found to be quite irreconcilable with the Gospel. But early as this last testimony was, St. John's Gospel is earlier still, and it would be contrary to all historic probability for those at least who believe in the genuineness of the Fourth Gospel, to pass over the evidence of an eyewitness and contemporary in a matter which affects the whole structure of his record, in favour of what may be supposed without improbability to be either arbitrary deductions from the language of prophecy, or mistaken combinations of traditional and evangelical material. Putting then our conclusions on the length of the ministry into connexion with the possible dates for its close, the first Passover might have been that of any one of the years 25, 27, 28, 31 A.D., with some presumption, by reason of the patristic evidence for the Crucifixion in 29 A.D., for the second of these alternatives. It will be now our business to test these results in the third and last department of our inquiry, namely, the independent grounds for fixing the commencement of the ministry.

III. Under this head will come evidence for the date of the commencement of St. John the Baptist's ministry; evidence for the date of the first Passover of Christ's ministry; and evidence for the date of His birth combined with that for His age at the Baptism. We propose to test these in the reverse order.

The primary factor in determining the date of the Nativity is supplied by the chronology of the life of Herod the Great. Our Lord was born under Herod, and forty days later was presented in the Temple, was taken into Egypt at the moment when Herod gave the command for the massacre of all children under two years of age at Bethlehem, and remained in exile until the death of the king. Now this certainly

occu
that
thias
the m
mers
On th
termi
fore,
B.C. 4
of B.
and s
a reig
who o
thirty
Nativ
mont
year
dark
age o
Innoc
sugge
sion '
interp
on the
will p
or eve
theref
with
likely
Christ
years

¹ T
conclus
later o
were pr
² O
Nativit
ingenio
the first
day of
ing ba
that th
about C
in that
April, E
comple
But Za
weeks—

inquiry,
 ending to
 e years;
 e Evan-
 Gospel at
 ustive;
 to the
 onizing
 in fact
 St. John.
 ministry
 two and
 Gospel,
 ne year,
 Gospel.
 Gospel is
 e Fourth
 and con-
 necture of
 out im-
 language
 nal and
 on the
 ole dates
 t of any
 umption,
 ixion in
 be now
 t depart-
 ounds for

e date of
 try; evi-
 ministry;
 t that for
 e in the

Nativity
 ne Great.
 ater was
 t at the
 assacre of
 remained
 certainly

occurred somewhere about B.C. 4, and we learn from Josephus that one of the latest of his crimes, the burning alive of Matthias and his companions, synchronized with an eclipse of the moon, and this eclipse has been calculated by astronomers to have taken place on the night of March 13, B.C. 4. On the other hand, the seven days' public mourning for him terminated shortly before the Passover; and we have, therefore, so far, the choice of placing his death in the spring of B.C. 4 (about April 1), or possibly a year later in the spring of B.C. 3. But the chronology of the reigns of his two sons and successors—Archelaus, who was deposed in A.D. 6 after a reign of between nine and ten years; and Herod Philip, who died in the twentieth year of Tiberius, after ruling for thirty-seven years—show that B.C. 3 is hardly admissible.¹ The Nativity must be dated, therefore, at the latest, some three months before April 1, B.C. 4, and the earliest days of that year will be the *terminus ad quem*. But we are wholly in the dark as to the duration of the sojourn in Egypt, or as to the age of the Holy Child at the time of the massacre of the Innocents; and even if the silence of St. Luke be taken to suggest that the former was not lengthy, and the expression 'from two years and under' in regard to the latter be interpreted of the jealous fears of a tyrant determined to be on the safer side, a sufficient margin of doubt survives, which will probably allow the Nativity to be placed six or twelve or even eighteen months before Herod's death, and will therefore interfere with any attempt to fix the month and day with precision.² Taking, however, the year B.C. 5 as most likely to be correct, we find that St. Luke tells us that Christ at His baptism was 'beginning to be about thirty years' (*ἀρχόμενος ὥσεί ἐτῶν τριάκοντα*), obviously a general

¹ Though it is to be noticed that B.C. 3 would be the most natural conclusion from the estimate of years of Herod's reign to be quoted later on. It must always be borne in mind that ancient chroniclers were prone to count years at both ends as units.

² Other material in (1) the traditional dates for the festival of the Nativity: January 6 in the East, December 25 in the West; (2) the ingenious calculation which, starting from the Talmudic tradition that the first course of priests had just entered on their ministry on the day of the destruction of the Temple, *c.* August 5, A.D. 70, and reckoning backwards one week for each of the twenty-four courses, shows that the eighth course, to which Zacharias belonged, went out of office about October 10, B.C. 6. If the conception of John the Baptist be placed in that month, the Annunciation in the 'sixth month' will fall in March or April, B.C. 5, and the Nativity in December, B.C. 5, or January, B.C. 4, a complete coincidence with the days traditionally observed in the Church. But Zacharias would, of course, be in office once in every twenty-four weeks—that is, twice in rather less than a year.

phrase which cannot be pressed to any such definite meaning, as, for instance, Mr. McClellan's 'thirty years and a few days.' Reckoning about thirty years from B.C. 5, we arrive at A.D. 26 as an approximate date—but approximate within rather uncertain limits—for the beginning of the ministry.

But there are two other dates in the Gospels which look as if they might fix more precisely a *terminus*, the one *ad quem* and the other *a quo*, for the era we are investigating. St. John gives us the year of the building of Herod's Temple after the beginning, St. Luke the year of Tiberius at the outset of the Baptist's preaching before the beginning, of Christ's ministry.

When our Lord was in Jerusalem at what was no doubt the first Passover after his baptism, the Jews stated in controversy with Him that the Temple had been forty-six years in building.¹ Should the doubt be raised whether the calculation referred to a point in past time at which the Temple was completed, rather than to the number of years from its commencement to the date of utterance, the former alternative could be ruled out of court at once; for while the essential portions of the work were finished long before this, in a far shorter period than forty-six years, the absolute conclusion of it preceded only by quite a short interval the outbreak of the Jewish War;² and the parallel phrase employed in Esdras of the earlier temple fully establishes the possibility of interpreting the aorist of a still incomplete building.

To fix the Temple chronology we turn to Josephus, who tells us in the *Jewish War* that it was in the fifteenth year of Herod, in the *Antiquities* that it was in his eighteenth year, that the building was begun. The years of Herod's reign in turn are reckoned at his death as 'thirty-four since he had had Antigonus slain' (B.C. 37), 'and thirty-seven since he had been declared king by the Romans' (B.C. 40),³ and the most obvious method of reconciling the discordant reckonings of the Temple years in Josephus's two works would be to suppose that he was using both these starting-points, the fifteenth and the eighteenth years of which coincide for *circa* 23 B.C. If this were the first year of the Temple, the forty-sixth would commence somewhere in A.D. 23, and the Passover of the forty-

¹ Jo. ii. 20, τεσσαράκοντα καὶ ἐξ ἔτεσιν ᾠκοδομήθη ὁ ναὸς οὗτος. Cf. 2 Esdras v. 11, ἀπὸ τότε ἕως τοῦ νῦν ᾠκοδομήθη καὶ οὐκ ἐτελείσθη.

² Josephus, *Antt.* xv. xi. 5, 6; xx. ix. 7.

³ The references are *B. J.* i. xxi. 1; *Antt.* xv. xi. 1; *Antt.* xvii. viii. 1, compared with xiv. xiv. 5, xvi. 4.

sixth year would be that of A.D. 24. But that the Baptism should anticipate this year would at least be quite inconsistent with our previous results. We might suspect then some blunder in the lower computation, that of the *Jewish War*; and, indeed, if we investigate the more elaborate account in the *Antiquities*, we find that (1) in an earlier passage, the battle of Actium, fought September 2, B.C. 31, is synchronized with the seventh year of Herod's reign, and (2) in a later passage, the dedication of Cæsarea Sebaste in the 192nd Olympiad (July, B.C. 12–July, B.C. 8), falls in Herod's twenty-eighth year,¹ both of which synchronisms agree only with the reckoning from B.C. 37; so that it is difficult not to believe that the same system is adopted in the intermediate passage now under discussion. According to this era, the first year of the Temple begins in B.C. 20, and the forty-sixth in A.D. 26, so that the Passover recorded by St. John will in all probability be that of A.D. 27. If this be so—and the links of the argument are to all appearance sound—a *terminus ad quem* is supplied for the commencement of the ministry, harmonizing admirably with our tentative conclusions as to the length of its duration and the date of its close.²

But St. Luke, it will at once be said, enables us to test our results with an equally definite *terminus a quo* for the beginning of the ministry, for 'in the fifteenth year of the reign of Tiberius Cæsar . . . came the word of God upon John, the son of Zacharias, in the wilderness.' We have had occasion already to see that this fifteenth year might synchronize with either A.D. 28 or 29, while, if strictly reckoned, it was from August of the one year to August of the other; and since the Baptist's ministry must obviously have preceded that of Christ by at least some period of time, it would be difficult on the most favourable interpretation to place the Baptism before the second half of A.D. 28, a result in marked antagonism to our previous *data*.

This difficulty has been so widely and so generally felt that it has often been proposed to calculate the years of Tiberius not from the death of Augustus at all, but from a supposed partition of the imperial power two years and a half sooner.³ There is, however, demonstrative proof that this

¹ Jos. *Antt.* xv. v. 2, xvi. v. 1.

² The same conclusion is worked out by Greswell, i. 192 f.

³ McClellan, p. 402; Greswell, i. 271. But cf. Dio. lvi. 28, lvii. 24; and a paper by Professor Pelham in the *Journal of Philology*, xvii. 27. Even if the two Antiochene coins were genuine, they would not be inconsistent with the date A.D. 13.

quasi-association in the empire belongs not to A.D. 12 but to A.D. 13, for the consuls named are those of that year. At the very earliest, even on this reckoning, the fifteenth year would only be A.D. 27. But it would be a conclusive objection in any case that no such method of reckoning this reign can be adduced elsewhere, while the *decennalia* of Tiberius were kept in A.D. 24. Certainly Josephus, the author whom it is most natural to bring into comparison with St. Luke, when he gives the length of the reign as twenty-two years, or more precisely twenty-two years and some months, must have been reckoning from the death of Augustus in August A.D. 14 to the death of Tiberius in March A.D. 37.

This result must be admitted to be disappointing in the extreme; for it introduces the one factor which seems irreconcilable with the best conclusions we have hitherto attained. If we are to accept the statement of St. Luke as it stands and force the rest of the evidence into accordance with it, and it with the rest, we should probably have to assume that the mission of the Baptist, the Baptism of Christ, and the first Passover of the ministry all fell in the early months of A.D. 28, and the Crucifixion two years later in A.D. 30. Yet there are serious objections to such a course. Not to mention the setting aside of the patristic evidence for A.D. 29 as the year of the Crucifixion—which if it stood alone would not be conclusive—this scheme makes the forty-sixth year of the Temple fall probably a year too late, and what is even more weighty still, crowds the events of the early months of A.D. 28 in an almost inconceivable fashion. Still, the only alternative visible is to throw over the statement of St. Luke altogether, as incorrect by one or, more likely, by two years. Without it we should undoubtedly select A.D. 26 for the ministry of the Baptist, A.D. 27 for the Baptism of Christ and the first Passover of His ministry, and A.D. 29 for the Crucifixion. It is not in itself impossible that the Evangelist may have shared the erroneous belief that the ministry lasted only a year, and reckoning backwards from A.D. 29 arrived thus at Tiberius' fifteenth year. Between these alternatives it is difficult or impossible to choose. If we experience disappointment in being unable to base the Gospel chronology with absolute exactitude, we have all the certainty that reasonable men can look for when the commencement and the close of Christ's ministry, the Baptism and the Crucifixion, are fixed each of them to one of two successive years. We are bound to establish the claim of our religion to be based on historic fact, but we need not, and ought not, to expect that in matters

which
be c
whic
the

ART
Cale

A N
daw
pres
acce
and
was
Hist
acce
later
Stat
prov
migh
to C
appe
Hen
quan
bear
prom
ther
the
prin
pers
grea
prac
reign
well
copy
selec
in th
sanc
Wha

which lie outside the substance of the faith its records shall be exempt from that proportion of uncertainty and vagueness which is incident to humanity: the vessels are earthen, though the treasure is divine.

ART. VII.—THE SPANISH CALENDAR, 1538–1542.

Calendar of Letters, Despatches, and State Papers relating to the Negotiations between England and Spain, preserved in the Archives of Simancas and elsewhere. Vol. VI., Part I., 1538–1542.

A NEW era of writing English history may be said to have dawned with the commencement of the second quarter of the present century. Up to that time it was difficult to get access to the documents preserved in the State Paper Office, and the splendid collection of papers in the Cottonian Library was but little known. The first part of Dr. Lingard's valuable History had appeared in 1819, and he had made use of all accessible sources of information. But it was not till six years later that a Royal Commission for printing and publishing State Papers was issued, and even then there was a jealous proviso that only such papers should be published which might be of advantage to the public 'and without prejudice to Our Service.' Accordingly in the year 1830 there appeared the first volume of the *State Papers of the Reign of Henry VIII.*, which was followed by ten other volumes in quarto, which appeared in slow succession, the last of them bearing date 1852. The eleventh volume duly fulfilled the promise that had been made twenty-two years before, that there would be two indices of places and persons, of which the latter would give a succinct chronological notice of the principal events in the life of each of the more remarkable personages. Of this index we may observe that it is still of the greatest value, though the rest of the work has been for most practical purposes almost superseded by Calendars of the reign, which are still in progress. The series was remarkably well edited, and contains comparatively few mistakes either of copying, printing, or annotating. But a comparison of the selection of papers with the much larger number that appear in the more recently published Calendars, issued under the sanction of the Master of the Rolls, suggests the question, What was the principle adopted in the selection? And we

have no solution of the difficulty to offer, though it has sometimes occurred to us to think, as we were referring to the originals, that there was perhaps an avoidance of such papers as were more than ordinarily difficult to read or to decipher. However that may be, it is certain that some most valuable documents had been passed by unnoticed, whilst others had been casually alluded to in the notes, but not printed at length in this collection.

About ten years after the last of these eleven volumes had appeared, the first issue of a new series of *Calendars of the Reign of Henry VIII.* was published, under the editorial management of the late Mr. Brewer, and this series has been continued for nearly thirty years up to the present time, at the rate of about one volume every two years, Mr. James Gairdner, now an assistant-keeper of the Records, having succeeded to the place of his late colleague, as whose coadjutor he had acted from the first. Assuredly no complaint of omission of State Papers or other documents could be alleged against this publication, for Mr. Brewer alone in this respect, of all the editors employed by the Master of the Rolls, was allowed to insert in his Calendar any original or copied paper, whether manuscript or printed, which contained evidence absolutely contemporaneous; and the consequence has been that we have here, in strict chronological order, such publications as the letters of Erasmus and others, which have been already seen in print. Thus the reign of Henry VIII. has been illustrated by everything that could be collected by an editor without having recourse to foreign archives, the contents of the volumes issued during Mr. Brewer's lifetime precisely corresponding with the announcement on their title as *Papers, Foreign and Domestic, preserved in the Public Record Office, the British Museum, and elsewhere in England*, there being no direct reference to any foreign archives or manuscript collections, though there are many extracts from works printed abroad, and a few from transcripts which had reached England previously to the publication of his volumes. Thus it happened that, in the earlier volumes of Mr. Brewer's Calendar, in default of access to the originals preserved in foreign archives, the editor had to avail himself of the few papers that had found their way into print in volumes such as Bradford's *Correspondence of the Emperor Charles V.* Simultaneously, however, with this issue, the Master of the Rolls had set on foot two other series of Despatches, which supplied the want left after the publication of the documents which were accessible in England. The first volume of the

Vene
had
in 18
of H
time
since
ous v
and
Engl
time
genro
ment
volum
Henr
being
Berge
a con
of th
time
which
of th
T
editor
seven
consic
have
Don
latter
Wolse
which
April
It
has g
transc
Pascu
Recon
Gaird
more
never
these
to his
ments
Thus
than v
of lab
VOL

Venetian Despatches, the editorial superintendence of which had been entrusted to the late Mr. Rawdon Brown, appeared in 1864; and the second volume, which begins with the reign of Henry VIII., appeared three years later, running for a time parallel with the English series, though it has long since outstripped it, there being, of course, much less laborious work for an editor whose business was only to produce and analyse despatches relating to the intercourse between England and the Venetian republic. Nearly at the same time the Spanish Papers were entrusted to the late M. Bergenroth, the successful decipherer of the Simancas documents. This series also soon outstripped the other, the second volume, embracing the first seventeen years of the reign of Henry VIII., having appeared in 1867, the English Calendar being two or three years behind it. Upon the death of Bergenroth, Don Pascual de Gayangos was appointed, after a considerable interval, to succeed him, and has taken charge of the Spanish Calendar since the year 1873, during which time he has superintended the editing of several volumes, of which the last, entitled vol. vi. part i., is the special subject of this article.

The first volume of the Spanish series issued by the new editor followed Bergenroth's last volume at an interval of seven years, during which time the English series had made considerable progress; and the English and Spanish series have been going on *pari passu* down to the present time, Don Pascual's volumes having overtaken Mr. Gairdner's, the latter having taken up Mr. Brewer's work from the death of Wolsey, and continued it to the year 1537, whilst the work which we are attempting to review reaches to the 30th of April, 1542.

It is to be regretted that the editor of the Spanish series has got ahead of the English, for it happens that many transcripts of papers which have been analysed by Don Pascual have been sent to England, and are now in the Record Office, and accordingly have been calendared in Mr. Gairdner's series. It seems superfluous trouble to print more than one epitome of a State Paper, and this, we suppose, never could have been intended by the original projector of these Calendars. Still Mr. Gairdner is acting quite according to his original instructions in including amongst his documents any paper that is preserved in any English collection. Thus the series superintended by him has a much wider range than when it was commenced under Mr. Brewer; and, waste of labour as this seems to involve, it is not without a slight

VOL. XXXIII.—NO. LXVI.

E E

compensating advantage, for the epitomes in the English series enable us in some cases to correct the mistakes into which the editor of the Spanish papers has fallen, which, we regret to say, are numerous, and, in some instances, of considerable importance, as will appear in the sequel.

But, before we proceed to give some account of the interesting volume whose title is at the head of this article, we may just call attention to the comparative value of the English and the foreign documents. Of course the documents referring to English affairs existing in England are far more numerous than those which exist in foreign repositories. Many of them refer to grants, patents, and the like, and are of little importance except to the person named in them, and perhaps have ceased by this time to have any value at all; but the documents in foreign archives naturally refer almost entirely to diplomatic transactions between the individual State to which they belong, and in whose custody they are preserved, and the English Government. And thus it happens that in these Spanish State Papers almost every document calendared is of some importance, there being nothing that relates to the private affairs of unknown individuals. Nor is this the only advantage possessed by this series; for though the title of these volumes professes to deal only with 'the negotiations between England and Spain,' the editor has largely exceeded his instructions, and has calendared a great number of documents which can scarcely be said to have any connexion with England, except that, as affecting some or other of the great European Powers, they may be thought to have some indirect influence on the affairs of this country. Accordingly many of the despatches calendared in this volume make no mention of England, and do not contain the remotest allusion to any Englishmen. We find no fault with the editor for this, for many of these documents are of the highest interest and importance, and throw a good deal of light upon the relations in which the Pope, the King of France, and the Emperor stood respectively to each other.

The period over which the volume runs begins with the summer of 1538, just after the truce agreed upon between Francis and the Emperor had been confirmed at Aigues Mortes, and reaches to the end of April 1542, when open hostility between the two sovereigns had all but broken out. And it is curious to trace the bearing of the different matrimonial proposals of Henry VIII. on the political affairs of the other two leading sovereigns of Europe. Indeed, the whole volume bristles with

matrimonial projects. The death of Jane Seymour had left Henry free to enter upon a new marriage, and we know that projects of this kind were entertained immediately after her decease. She died on October 17, 1537, and within a week the King had instructed Cromwell to write to his ambassador in France to make inquiries about Margaret, the King's daughter, who was afterwards Duchess of Savoy, and the Dowager Duchess of Longueville, who was at that time affianced to James V. of Scotland, to whom she was married in 1538. The truce agreed upon between the Emperor and the King of France was very annoying to Henry, and the negotiations which he had heard were going on between the Emperor and the Pope for a marriage between the grandson of the Pope and Charles's illegitimate daughter, the Duchess of Florence, seemed likely to cement an alliance which would be still more displeasing to the King of England, who had so recently severed himself from any connexion with the Pope. The one idea in the English monarch's mind was how to make most profit out of the untoward circumstances in which he found himself; and so, whilst negotiations were pending for his marriage with Christina, the Dowager Duchess of Milan, Sir Francis Bryan, the ambassador in France, was instructed to propose a still stricter alliance between England and France, to which end Henry had the assurance actually to suggest that he would himself cross the sea in order to have an interview with, and to make his choice among, seven or eight ladies of royal blood of the Houses of Lorraine, Vendôme, and Nevers, if Francis on his part would agree to send them for inspection to Calais under the convoy of his sister Margaret, the Queen of Navarre. The King of France replied in terms such as Bryan might have expected.

'It is not the custom in France to send damsels of that rank and of such noble and princely families to be passed in review as if they were hackneys for sale; besides which, if one of them were selected the rest would lose in estimation. If, however, the King wishes to marry one of the number, he may at once, and in the proper manner, apply for her hand, and with the certainty that he will get a speedy and favourable answer to his request' (p. 6).

And here we have to notice a most ridiculous blunder of the editor's. The words of the English ambassador plainly imply that the Queen of Navarre was to act as chaperon to the young ladies whom Henry had had the indelicacy to propose should be sent to Calais for him to make his choice from; but Don Pascual de Gayangos, supposing she was to be

one of them, and knowing that she had been married to the titular King of Navarre, ventures to suggest that for *queen* we should read *princess*, and that her daughter Jeanne, a child of about seven years old, is intended. Had the editor paid the least attention to a despatch which he has printed only three pages further on, he would scarcely have made another mistake in attributing to Queen Eleanor of France a saying which is plainly one of Margaret, Queen of Navarre. It runs as follows :—

'They say that when Bryan, Henry's ambassador, made the proposal of an interview at Calais, the Queen said to him that she was not the keeper of harlots, and that the daughters of the royal blood of France never went out except in company with the queen of that country. In all other things she approved of and confirmed the King's decision, thus showing that she neither would accept the charge of taking the damsels [to Calais] nor did the King propose it to her' (p. 10).

We may observe that in the recently published correspondence of Castillon and Marillac, the former, who was at that time Francis's ambassador in England, remonstrated with the King in most indecent language, at which he says even Henry blushed whilst he laughed. From Castillon's letter to the King we gather how exactly the imperial ambassador at Paris reported to the Emperor all that was going on between Francis and the English ambassador. It appears that Francis himself told the whole story to the imperial ambassador, who added that the High Constable had added to the information given him by the King, that amongst the ladies was a daughter of the Duke of Vendôme, who was a nun in a convent, on which the Constable had remarked that he had no doubt that, as the King of England now considers himself a Pope in his own dominions, he would have preferred the nun to any other daughter of the royal blood of France.

It is scarcely likely that the Emperor was as free in talking to the French ambassador at his Court about the intentions of the English king as Francis was to the imperial ambassador. But in the light of these despatches, compared with the letters from Castillon to the French monarch, it may be seen how entirely Henry was deceived in thinking that his negotiations with either of these potentates were unknown to the other; for all the time proposals for the marriage of the King of England with Christina, Dowager Duchess of Milan, were still going on; the marriage with a French princess having for its sole object to consolidate the alliance between France and England, and that with the Duchess being in-

tended to make common cause with the Emperor, and to detach him if possible from his supposed engagements with Francis. And this is, in point of fact, in brief the history of all the negotiations on the part of the King of England during the four years occupied by the volume till the truce of Nice was finally broken.

Whether the King of England really intended a marriage with Christina may be doubted. He probably thought it unlikely that his proposal that she too should come to Calais with Mary, the Queen of Hungary, the sister of the Emperor, who was regent of the Low Countries, would be accepted, and, moreover, affected to be jealous for his own reputation if the rumour should prove true that her marriage had been proposed with the Duke of Cleves, as people might say that, as he had been first in the field, either the Duchess's hand had been refused to him or had been granted upon the Duke's refusal.

And here we must again enter our protest against the miserable style in which this volume has been edited. In the single despatch from which we have gathered this last piece of information we have marked a dozen passages where there is either a mistake of writing or of printing independently of such awkward expressions as *Sir Cromwell*, *Sir Coban*, *Sir Feris*, &c., the word *Sir* apparently being used as the translation of the French *Sieur de*. In his explanation of the names, which, it must be admitted, are much mutilated by French and Spanish writers, he is frequently wrong, and when he is right in the main he makes slight mistakes, which, however, are not misleading, but only show ignorance on the editor's part. Thus *Sir Feris* is explained as *Sir Walter Devereux Ferreys*, meaning *Walter Devereux*, Lord *Ferrers* of *Chartley*. Again, in the same despatch the French ambassador at the Court of England is explained as being *Marillac*, whereas it was really *Castillon*, *Marillac* not having arrived in England till the following year (1539). We have also great fault to find with many other notes. In some cases he has explained two or three times over who the persons alluded to are, and sometimes omits any explanation altogether, as, for instance, in the despatch (p. 42) where the English ambassador at the Court at Brussels is alluded to as having 'died the other day,' no explanation is given. It would have been quite sufficient to insert the name in brackets, as he has done elsewhere, instead of adding a note at the end of the volume that it was *John Hutton* whose death is recorded, September 5. And here we find also that the

author has discovered his mistake, just mentioned, in confusing Castillon with Marillac. Nevertheless we gladly acknowledge the great amount of information supplied in many of the notes as regards obscure personages in the history of the time.

Whatever were Henry's intentions as regards the marriage with the Duchess, or as to the proposal of that of his daughter Mary with the Infant Dom Louis of Portugal, it is pretty certain, from the correspondence, that the Emperor never intended the former marriage to take place. He must have known that no such alliance could be effected without a Papal dispensation, as the parties were within the prohibited degrees of affinity, Christina being a niece of Catharine of Aragon, and that there was no probability of the Pope either granting or the King applying for any such dispensation, whilst as regards the project for marrying the Princess Mary to the Infant of Portugal, there would arise the difficulty of Henry's being forced to pronounce her legitimate, whilst, on other grounds, the good understanding that existed between the Emperor and the French king at this moment rendered him comparatively indifferent to the alliance with England. Charles was now on good terms with Francis, and was intending to secure the good offices of Pope Paul III. by a marriage between his illegitimate daughter, the Duchess of Florence, and Ottavio Farnese, the Pope's grandson, which had been on the tapis for some months, much to the disgust, apparently, of the young Duchess herself, her proposed husband being a mere boy, younger than herself, and she, though already a widow, not being yet sixteen years old. The proposal seems to have been part of the bargain between the Pope and the Emperor when Paul took the trouble to journey to Nice in order to patch up the truce between him and the French king. The marriage was actually solemnized November 3, 1538, and the Pope expressed his hope that at Christmas it might be consummated. The Cardinal Archinto (and here we are driven to the index to find out that his eminence was Archbishop of Milan) spoke the oration in praise of the married couple, of whose subsequent relations the less that is said the better.

As to the marriage of Henry VIII. with the Dowager Duchess of Milan, we hear no more of that after the end of the year 1538, whilst the proposed alliance with the royal family of France fell through somewhat earlier, and before the end of the following year arrangements had been completed for the union of Henry with Anne of Cleves, which took place in January 1540.

serve
the
cour
with
thes
priv
know
bass
of fo
mark
the
appe
this
care
the
with
the S
ject.
and i
queen
had
Engl
T
a des
to th
that
bassa
enter
the I
doubt
been
confid
tellige
lady,
time.
writes
death
regard
exper
So pr
failed.
well, i
the gr
weath

It is, of course, not to be wondered at that papers preserved at Vienna or Simancas should throw a new light upon the diplomatic transactions between this country and foreign courts, especially as to the relations of the King of England with the Emperor. What is most curious is that many of these letters give us information as to matters of a more private nature which must at the time have been better known in England and to English people than to the ambassadors at foreign courts or than to the accredited agents of foreign Powers in England. Yet there are many very remarkable events detailed in this volume which have escaped the notice of all English historians, and of which there appears to be no record in our own State Paper Office. Of this kind are the accounts of the arrival and subsequent career of Anne of Cleves. One might have thought that the *Chronicle of Calais* and Wriothesley's *Diary*, together with the papers published in the first and eighth volumes of the *State Papers* of the reign, had almost exhausted the subject. Yet we have in this volume some very considerable and interesting additions to our knowledge about the divorced queen's relations both with the King and the woman who had supplanted her in so short a time after her arrival in England.

The first mention of Anne of Cleves in these pages is in a despatch of October 29, 1539, from the Marquis de Aguilar to the Emperor, from Rome, in which the writer observes that the Pope had said some days ago that the French ambassador had told him that a contract of marriage had been entered into between the King of England and the sister of the Duke of Cleves. The imperial ambassador at Rome doubted the fact, because the French ambassador had not been officially informed of it, but had only heard it from a confidential friend, and there was no confirmation of the intelligence from Chapuys or from any other quarter. The lady, however, had been more or less on the tapis for some time. The first mention we have of her is by Hutton, who writes to Cromwell from Paris, almost immediately after the death of Jane Seymour, in no very encouraging terms as regards her beauty, but observes that, as he had no great experience among ladies, he finds his commission rather hard. So probably she was not thought of till other projects had failed. More than a year afterwards it appears that Cromwell, in March 1539, was urging on the marriage, alleging the great beauty of the lady. Her detention by stress of weather at Calais, and her arrival in England, are minutely

described by Marillac, the French ambassador, who speaks of her in somewhat disparaging terms, and mentions her twelve or fifteen attendants as being all as badly dressed as herself. Though not possessed of beauty, she had, he says, a determined and resolute countenance. The same person gives a detailed account of the divorce, which, however, does not differ much from what we have read in the histories of the period. The most remarkable revelations with regard to her occur in Chapuys's correspondence after the marriage with Catharine Howard had been accomplished. The first note of alarm was sounded by Chapuys informing the Queen of Hungary that, though he did not himself believe in any reconciliation between her and the King, which he should take every opportunity of thwarting, yet this was an opinion which was spreading, as Queen Catharine was not yet pregnant. Two days later he writes to the Queen, being still further puzzled, having heard that Anne had sent the King a present of two horses, and that she had been received by the Queen, with whom and the King she had supped at Hampton Court, after which the Queen and Anne had danced together, and on the following day all three had dined together, after which Anne mounted her horse and returned to Richmond. And almost every particular of this is confirmed by a despatch of the French ambassador, Marillac. In a subsequent letter he reports to the Queen how the King had consoled the Queen, who had begun to feel some jealousy of Anne, saying that if he had to marry again he would never retake Madame de Clèves, though Chapuys says that many think he might be induced to take this step under fear of Francis making war upon him. Whether Anne herself had ever entertained any such hopes must remain uncertain, but in a letter to the Emperor upon the disgrace of Catharine Howard the ambassador says—

'I hear also that Madame de Clèves has greatly rejoiced at the event, and that, in order to be nearer the King, she is coming to, if she is not already at, Richmond. I would not for many considerations touch in the least on the subject of Madame de Clèves to the Lord Privy Seal, waiting until there be a better opportunity and I myself may go to Court' (p. 396).

As time went on, however, and after the execution of Catharine Howard, Chapuys began to be a little less confident, and perhaps was somewhat influenced by the French ambassador's evident belief that there would be an alliance with the young Duke of Cleves by means of the King again

taking Anne to be his wife. There probably was never the least chance of his doing so; but the Emperor evidently thought it possible, as in writing to Chapuys he says that, though it does not seem likely, yet Chapuys must watch the affair closely, seeing such a reconciliation would be very injurious to his interests, so that he must use every precaution in his power to dissuade the King from taking such a step. And this injunction was repeated more than once. It is a curious revelation made by Marillac, who professed to believe that Anne would be again received as Queen, and who goes the length of saying that everybody thinks so.

And here we must enter another protest against the slipshod manner in which this volume has been edited. We have referred more than once to information supplied by the despatches of Marillac, the French ambassador, who succeeded Castillon at the Court of England. All of this correspondence is printed at length in one of the volumes of the *Inventaire Analytique des Archives des Affaires Etrangères*, published at Paris in 1885—a book which was, or at least ought to have been, well known to writers of the history of the period in 1890, when this Calendar was issued. And so the long extracts which have been printed by the editor have no business to appear in this volume. Moreover, they are inserted most awkwardly in two different places, six pages of extracts appearing in the 'Additional Notes and Corrections,' and ten more having been afterwards added in his 'Introductory Remarks.' Again, upon comparing them with the French volume, we find about five and twenty mistakes of date or address or annotation or translation. In fact, throughout the whole volume the reader is bound to be on his guard about the dates, it frequently happening that the date assigned in the margin is different from that in the body or at the end of a given despatch. No doubt Marillac's letters are of first-rate importance, and supply a gap which is left in that of Chapuys, who had been for many years Charles's ambassador at the English Court; for there are no letters written by Chapuys from London between the dates October 11, 1538, and September 3, 1540. For the private affairs and gossip of the Court of England during all this period we are indebted to Marillac; and it is very remarkable that for all these particulars, which might have been thought more likely to be detailed from English sources, most of the intelligence both at this time and at other periods of the reign comes from the despatches of Venetian or other foreign ambassadors. The Venetian Calendar is specially rich in such matters.

As regards matters of larger importance, most people will be surprised, we think, at the prominence in all these papers of matrimonial projects, both of those which were completed and of those which came to nothing. Of the latter class is the narrative of the intercourse held between the Princess Mary and Philip, the young Duke of Bavaria. The poor princess, who had been so hardly used because of her fidelity to her mother, and had so bravely stood out against her father, now that she was left without any confidential advisers—for Chapuys, upon whom she had most depended, had left England—had given in to Henry and his vicegerent, but was still considered and pronounced to be only his illegitimate daughter, and was on that account scarcely eligible for any high matrimonial connexion. Moreover it was thought that the King was not likely to offer her hand to anyone who might be powerful enough hereafter to assert and enforce her rights to the throne as having been born in lawful wedlock. But there could be no objection on this score to the young Duke of Bavaria. The French ambassador expresses his doubts about there being any real intention of bringing this marriage to pass, although he details some amusing particulars of the meeting of the parties, which he seems to think was of a clandestine nature. He says she was secretly conducted to a house within the gardens of Westminster Abbey, where the Duke, after meeting with the encouragement of a kiss, had a long conversation with her, partly in Latin, but also partly in German; and the odd part of the transaction is that the German part of the conversation was done through the medium of an interpreter; and the upshot of the matter was that both the young people agreed to inform the King of their resolution to marry if he could be induced to give his consent to their union. It is not easy to understand how Marillac obtained his information, or to pronounce how much truth there is in his narrative. No immediate negotiations seem to have resulted from the interview, but in May 1541 an agent of the Duke's arrived, and then, according to Chapuys, who was then again in London, the answer to the agent was by no means unfavourable, and there was some chance of the Duke of Bavaria being recalled. This looks as if, in the winter of 1539, he had been dismissed. It is very curious to see how the Emperor and Francis were both kept cognizant, through information derived from their ambassadors, of the minutest details of court life; and still more remarkable is the absence of tidings of such things from State papers of a purely English source.

O
politi
by th
the m
ful an
Cath
rumo
that
be th
hope
pudia
W
on th
ing o
betw
the l
sulte
towa
bosom
runs
speci
prev
at Ca
again
it wa
a pre
detr
prese
certa
guar
was
close
rogu
a pr
Vene
thoug
unwi
Rom
suspe
autu
at R
hope
made
they
was

Of course all these proposals take their colour from the political transactions of the day, and were greatly influenced by the religious movements in Europe. Just at the time of the marriage with Anne of Cleves Cromwell had been successful and Protestantism was in the ascendant; but in May 1541 Catharine Howard was in possession, though perhaps the rumour of a divorce had already spread, owing to the fact that the Queen seemed unlikely to bear a child; and it may be that the Protestant cause was again looking up, in the vain hope that the King would again try his luck with the repudiated Anne of Cleves.

Whilst all these matrimonial and political affairs were going on there was a general talk all over Europe of the summoning of a General Council to settle the important disputes between Catholics and Protestants, a Council which never had the least chance of doing anything of the kind, but which resulted eventually in the assembly at Trent, which did so much towards amending the frightful state of things within the bosom of the Roman Church. Some notice of this project runs through the whole volume. The King of England was specially desirous to throw every obstacle in its way and to prevent its assembling at all. His objection to its being held at Cambray was only the same that he would have urged against any other place that could be named. And wherever it was to be held it was provided in all negotiations that, as a preliminary engagement, nothing should be treated to the detriment of the King of England, who did not intend to be present at it; but with such stipulation the Emperor was certainly unwilling to comply, and probably unable to guarantee it if he had been ever so willing. In April 1539 it was debated in consistory whether the Council should be closed or only suspended, and it was finally decided to pro-
 rogue it, one among other difficulties being the selection of a proper place, Vicenza being absolutely refused by the Venetians. To this the Emperor was willing to consent, though professing some anxiety for its early celebration, being unwilling to have it thought that he and the King of the Romans had been the main instruments in bringing about the suspension. And so we hear no more of the Council till the autumn of 1541. It appears from a letter of the ambassadors at Rome, written to the Emperor in November, that they still hoped that it might be arranged, though the Pope had not yet made up his mind about it. A few days later (November 22) they again wrote that the unanimous opinion of the cardinals was that a General Council ought to be held, lest it should be

thought that the Apostolic See was throwing hindrances in the way of its being convened. The chief difficulty seemed to be as to the place where it should be held, the Pope being unwilling to summon it for any city of Germany, and objecting to Trent because it was unfit for the purpose, being a narrow, unhealthy, and scantily provided city. The Imperial ambassadors alleged their objection to Ferrara and Mantua—to which latter place the Council had actually been summoned to meet in May 1537—both of which places had been mentioned by the Cardinals, but had been thought unfit, as it would cause some exasperation on the part of the Separatists, and that to give such an answer to the Germans in reply to their application would be exceedingly dangerous under the circumstances. The Pope was certainly wiser than the Imperial ambassadors, for he knew very well that nothing would induce the Separatists to attend a Council summoned under Papal authority, and was sure that German Catholic prelates would attend wherever it was called. The Imperial ambassadors seem to have thought more about the attendance of princes than of prelates. Accordingly, as Mantua and Ferrara seemed undesirable, Cambray was mentioned as being an Imperial city within the limits of Germany, subject to its own prelate, and conveniently situated for England and France to send their representatives, though all parties must have been pretty well assured that the King of England would suffer none of his bishops to appear at the Council, and there was, moreover, considerable danger of the French king refusing to come, a contingency which it was thought would much embarrass his Holiness. The Pope himself seems to have been extremely reserved, but expressed his opinion first in favour of Mantua, then of Ferrara, and failing these fell back upon Modena, making no mention of Cambray, and he hoped the indiction would not be later than Pentecost 1542.

As a matter of fact the Bull for the assembling of the celebrated Council of Trent was issued in May 1542, but the present volume, reaching only to the end of April of that year, of course contains no allusion to this. It was to meet on the 1st of November, and no allusion to the King of England occurs in it, though the Emperor and the Most Christian King are specially invited, unless, indeed, he may be considered as included in the expression '*ceteros reges, duces, principes.*'

In this volume, as in the preceding ones, the letters of Chapuys convey most information as to English affairs. But, as we have already said, he was absent from England during a great portion of the period comprised in it. His letters,

how
Sept
addre
Mary
and a
and I
comp
dates
writt
refer
for n
but a
letter
and
he m
supp
is re
been
notic
other
vexa
and
in ci
offen
defen
Ann
depr
the c

I
and
cem
day
bein
Coun
if w
in K
coul
morr
had
Coun
driv
had
who
tuna
find

however, are tolerably continuous from the beginning of September 1540 for a year and eight months, some being addressed to the Emperor, some to the Emperor's sister, Mary, Queen of Hungary, the Governess of the Low Countries, and a few to Granvelle, the First Councillor of the Emperor and Keeper of the Seals. And here we have to renew our complaints against the editor for his great carelessness about dates. In one of the earliest letters to the Queen of Hungary, written after his return to England, December 5, 1540, he refers to his last letter, which, if we may trust this Calendar for not having omitted a letter, had been written October 23; but a note to the word 'last' informs us that 'Chapuy's last letter is dated the 16th.' But, as he does not name the month, and as the 16th does not precede the 5th day of the month, he must mean some preceding month. We incline to the supposition that for 16 we ought to read 31, and that Chapuys is referring to the letter of the 31st of October, which has been duly calendared in this volume. This mistake has been noticed at the end of the volume. There are innumerable others which present no difficulty, though they are somewhat vexatious, many of them being a substitution of *ult.* for *inst.*, and *vice versâ*. In this letter there is a piece of gossip written in cipher about the new Queen, *i.e.* Catharine Howard, being offended with the Princess Mary for not showing her as much deference as to the two previous queens, Jane Seymour and Anne of Cleves, and who had attempted to revenge herself by depriving her of two of her maids, but at the time of writing the quarrel seems to have been made up.

In the next letter, which is addressed to the Emperor, and not to 'the same,' as the editor gives it, and is dated December 23—though how in that case 'the day before yesterday' can be the 24th we fail to understand—he relates his being accompanied by Mylord Park to the King at Hampton Court. '*The day before yesterday*' is also probably a mistake, if we may trust Marillac's despatch of December 22, printed in Kaulek's volume, p. 251; and the French ambassador could scarcely be mistaken in his assertion that on that very morning Chapuys, who had not seen the King once since he had presented his letters of credence, had gone to Hampton Court. As no explanation is given of Mylord Park, we are driven to the supposition that Sir William Parr is meant, who had been created Lord Parr in 1538, the father of the lady who became the sixth and last wife of the King, who fortunately survived him; but upon referring to the index we find his name inserted with a query, and a cross-reference to

one Sir Thomas Parr of Kendal, a person whose name we do not happen to be acquainted with. In this one page, then, we have detected four mistakes, and we are sorry to have to add that it is not the only one in which we have found as many.

We have already alluded to Chapuys's letters on the subject of the mutual relations of Catharine Howard and Anne of Cleves. Writing on Easter Day 1541, he notices a conspiracy of some priests and others, in number about fifty, to murder the Bishop of Llandaff, governor of the northern counties, all of whom had been arrested. The French ambassador, in relating the same occurrence, represents their numbers as being from eighty to a hundred. They had hoped for assistance from the Scots just over the border, and a few days later he relates an incursion of Scots, who had taken and sacked and set fire to an English town. At this time the attitude of Scotland was of considerable importance. War between Francis and the Emperor was looming in the near distance, and both sovereigns were anxious for the alliance of England, Henry evidently coquetting with both, and prepared to make what capital he might be able, but inclining really towards the Emperor, whilst the Pope, for fear of Charles obtaining too great power in Italy, was rather favouring the French king. The jealousy that existed between Marillac and Chapuys is very plainly displayed in the correspondence of this period, and the two sovereigns whom they represented were each of them desirous of a closer alliance with the King of England, now that the twelve years' truce agreed upon at Nice and Aigues Mortes seemed likely to come to an untimely end. Thus on June 1, or more probably on the 2nd, which is the date given in Marillac's Correspondence, Francis writes to his ambassador that he is to inform the Duke of Norfolk that his fervent desire is to live in perfect harmony and everlasting friendship with the King of England, his master, who would always find in him his best friend and brother, urging also that no trust can be placed on the Emperor, who thinks of nothing but of waxing greater and greater every day, and aspires to that odious universal monarchy so detrimental to Christendom. Almost in exactly the same words the King of England had said to Marillac at the beginning of March 1541, when speaking of a suggested marriage of the Emperor with the Princess Mary, that it would be madness for him to consent to any such arrangement with the Emperor, who had before now deceived him, and was only anxious to be universal monarch of Christen-

dom
the
whic
the v
says
peop
' I b
shall
sam
the
In a
the
mea
reac

allian
use
your
what
will,
possi
the f
that
fact,
said
sell
servi
the l
the K
he th
True
amb
delib
end,
the n
is su
at al
will
and

grac
find
men
prac
We
1542

dom, and would not then be content. Only a few days later the Imperial ambassador sent on a letter enclosed in one which came from Francis to his ambassador, in all probability the very letter in which these professions occur 'by which,' he says, 'your Majesty will see what amount of affection these people profess to have for his person,' meaning the Emperor's. 'I beg and entreat that it may be kept secret, as otherwise I shall be unable in future to get more information from the same source.' How Chapuys got intelligence of what was in the French ambassador's despatches is told in another place. In a letter of July 16, in reply to letters of the Emperor of the 11th inst., as the editor gives it, but which we suppose means of the 1st inst., as no letters could possibly have reached England from Spain in five days, he says in cipher—

'I will do my best to keep up the negotiations for a closer alliance and friendship in the same state in which it is now, making such use of my instructions as I may deem most fit and convenient for your Majesty's purposes, without amplifying or retrenching anything whatsoever, unless I receive your Majesty's express commands. I will, moreover, use all diligence and spare no trouble in obtaining, if possible, from the French ambassador's man a copy of the cipher the former uses, as well as some original letters addressed to him that may enlighten your Majesty as to the doings of the French. In fact, I can assure you that no money shall be spared in bribing the said man; for were I to be ruined by the transaction, and have to sell myself, he shall have as great a reward as he may ask for his services. The man himself has lately sent me a message to say that the last despatch which the ambassador, his chief, has received from the King (his master) is unimportant, and has been chiefly made out, as he thinks, for the purpose of acknowledging the receipt of his letters. True it is that one of King Francis's councillors has written to the ambassador a letter saying that whatever people may think of the deliberations of the German Diet, they cannot but be useful in the end, and highly advantageous for the King (their master); for if the result be favourable to Germany and to your Majesty, the Pope is sure to go over to France, whereas if the Diet takes no resolution at all, and the affairs remain *in statu quo*, then the King of France will have closer understanding and connexion with, and more favour and assistance from, Germany than he ever had' (p. 341).

The Imperial ambassador's conduct may seem very disgraceful, but it is not unique in its kind. Not only do we find the Emperor making no objection to Chapuys's announcement, but we have the account of almost exactly similar practices on the part of the French ambassador in England. We must also let him tell his own story. On September 3, 1540, he writes as follows to the High Constable. We give

the letter as it appears in English in Don Pascual's introduction, premising only that, as usual, he has blundered in the dates. His reply is to Francis's letters of the 6th and 15th ult., not of the 6th and 11th inst., as given by Don Pascual:—

'As far as I can judge, he (*i.e.* Chapuys) has more malice than cunning. There is no reason whatever to regret his having returned to this country, where I can assure you he will make no way at all with this King or his ministers; for he is very much disliked by them, and more particularly by the Duke of Norfolk, who has often spoken to me of his tricks and intrigues in past times, as well as of the cold and ungracious answers he got whenever he made overtures in the Privy Council. This statement of the Duke's I have been able to verify, owing to my having found in the very house which I now inhabit, and wherein the Imperial ambassador himself formerly resided no less than nine years, a bundle of papers and minutes of his own despatches, which he inconsiderately left behind him when he ought to have kept it as carefully as the greatest treasure he possessed in this world. Should he come to know now that those documents and papers are in my hands, he would regret the more his having returned to this country. But I will carefully keep my own secret, and no one shall know a word about it unless you, Monseigneur, order me to reveal it. I must, however, not omit to state that the reading of the above-mentioned papers and drafts of his correspondence with the Emperor's ministers has fully convinced me of the malignity of the Imperial ambassador and of his intrigues, grossly conceived and worse executed as they were, although inspired by a desire of doing all the harm he could to the King, our master. This has been lately confirmed by this King, who tells me that since his return to England the said Imperial ambassador has been playing the same game, though, whatever mien he may put on it, he has no reason to be satisfied with the answer he has received to his overtures, which was indeed so meagre and unsatisfactory that, since the first audience he had from the King to present his credentials, he has not called again, and has remained at home without going out of the house, except twice or three times that he has come to mine, to hear what news I have from France.'¹

Such is a specimen of the diplomatic transactions of the middle of the sixteenth century, and a comparison of the two letters will show what a double game the King of England was playing, and how little scruple he felt in deceiving both the French king and the Emperor when anything was to be gained by such deceit, or, as Don Pascual puts it—

'the mere perusal of his (*i.e.* Marillac's) despatches to King Francis or his ministers will persuade the reader of King Henry's superior talent for diplomacy as it was understood at that time; for, if his conversations with the French and Imperial ambassadors are

¹ Introduction, p. vii; Kaulek, p. 218.

faithfully reported, there can be no doubt that he was deceiving them both as to his real sentiments and views.¹

Thus it happens that when we have arrived at the last half of the volume the tables were completely changed. The King, about whose alliance the two other sovereigns had been comparatively indifferent, was now the person to whom they were endeavouring to represent their own friendship as being of the closest, both of them being anxious to secure him in the probable and almost certain event of war breaking out between them. So completely changed was the prospect that when Francis writes to his ambassador on August 9, 1541, he in the strongest terms denies that there is any chance of his coming to terms with the Emperor, with whom, though urged by the Queen of Hungary, he would not consent to have an interview, and never would without 'letting my good brother the King of England know of it first, and asking his opinion and advice on the matter, since I am quite satisfied with having seen the Emperor once' (p. 345).

Here, again, we notice a foolish note of the editor's. One would have thought the expression 'de l'autre mois' could have had but one explanation, viz. the month before; yet we have here supplied by the editor '(July?)'. He had only to turn to the French correspondence of Marillac to find the King's actual letter of July 29, which is here alluded to. The copy of this letter, as well as of two others written by Francis to Marillac, on August 12 and 28 respectively, were of course obtained surreptitiously. The last two are only abstracts of three long letters. They were sent in cipher to the Emperor, and contain the account of the project for alliance between France and England, to be cemented by a marriage of the Duke of Orleans with the Princess Mary. The full text, or nearly the whole of both letters, is printed in Marillac's correspondence, from which also we gather the date August 28, which the editor has omitted to supply. The copy he analyzed was no doubt without date; but he might easily have found it out by reference to the French ambassador's correspondence, which supplies the additional information that Francis was willing to take either Mary or Elizabeth for his son, and that Henry had it already in contemplation to declare his daughter the Princess Mary legitimate. All talk of her marriage with the Emperor seems now to have been at an end. And in all probability there never had been any serious thoughts about it either on Henry's or

¹ Introduction, p. xxi.

the Emperor's part. Several other ciphered despatches follow this, which are without date and are grievously misplaced by this editor. The first of these is placed between two other despatches of August 28 and 29 respectively, but really belongs to September 26, and was written from York by Marillac to Francis on that day. This letter is of considerable importance; for it discloses Henry's real intention, which was to keep open the negotiations for the marriage of the Duke of Orleans with the Princess Mary, in view of future contingencies. The matter was supposed to be a profound secret, but was all revealed to the Emperor through the dishonest tampering of his ambassador with Marillac's servant. The cipher fairly represents in an abridged form what appears at greater length in the original letter, from which it seems that the Duke of Norfolk was negotiating this matter without apprising his colleagues of the Privy Council, who were likely to allege the difficulty about the Duke of Orleans coming to the crown of France, and so, in the event of Mary succeeding to that of England, governing this country from abroad by means of a deputy, the same objection having been alleged to her proposed marriage with her cousin the Emperor. At any rate it appears that Francis was more keen upon the proposal than the English king, who foresaw a probable rupture between Francis and Charles, and was quite content to bide his time, professing, just for the present, a willingness to give the Princess Mary precedence after any other children he might yet have, and before Elizabeth. Meanwhile each of the ambassadors is entertaining the other at his own house, and writing to his employer to tell how each evades the other's questions as to the affairs of their respective sovereigns. As a specimen we select Chapuys's despatch of October 26, 1541, to the Queen of Hungary:—

'The French ambassador came the other day to surprise me at dinner-time. Thinking that I would not be able to drag out of him any information with regard to King Francis's answer, and fearing also lest in conversing about political affairs in general some expression might escape me as to make him suspect what is really the fact, that I have read King Francis's letters to him, I refrained from touching on politics, and there was only mirth and good cheer in the evening besides some light conversation on his own journey to York, with which he seems by no means satisfied' (p. 375).

In this same letter Chapuys expresses his opinion that neither Henry on his side nor the French Council on theirs was at all anxious for the marriage, though he thinks Francis himself was in earnest about it, because of his affection for

the
eld
This
to h
in al
or Ca
respo
the c
is no
bribin
given
same
accou
How
this e
for th

'L
positio
ing her
been m
presum
and wa
the aff
(p. 384)

Now,
betwe
letter
tion be
that sh
taken
he wou
'last L
passes,
editor's
the Im
take se
Cha
written
ambass
transcri
was wis
to set F
the dan
tionate

the Duke of Orleans, though acting against the will of his eldest son, the Dauphin, as well as that of his councillors. This letter enclosed a duplicate copy of Francis's last answer to his ambassador, which is not printed in this volume, but in all probability is the letter written by Francis from Cuzery or Cazery on October 7, which is printed in Marillac's correspondence, p. 345. After this there appears to be a gap in the correspondence of Francis and his ambassador, as there is no extant letter till November 15. But Chapuys was still bribing Marillac's servant, who, he says (November 10), 'has given me hope of some original letters.' In a letter of the same date addressed to the Queen of Hungary he gives the account of the first alarm about the misconduct of Catharine Howard. And here we are puzzled, because we have found this editor at fault so often, and are quite at a loss to account for the expressions used. The letter runs thus :—

'Last Lent I wrote to your Majesty that the King, feigning indisposition, was ten or twelve days without seeing his queen or allowing her to come into his room ; that during all that time there had been much consultation and talk of a divorce, but that, owing to some presumption that she was in the family way, or because the means and ways to bring about a divorce were not yet sufficiently prepared, the affair dropped, and has since been dormant until the 5th inst.' (p. 384).

Now, there is no hint of any such matter in the correspondence between Chapuys and the Queen of Hungary except in a letter dated May 26, which alludes to an alleged conversation between the King and Queen, in which Catharine had said that she had heard rumours that Anne of Cleves was to be taken back, the King replying that if he had to marry again he would certainly not take Anne for his wife. The words 'last Lent' are given as the translation of 'dois les caresmaux passes,' which, for all we know, may be a mistake of the editor's or of the person who deciphered the holograph of the Imperial ambassador, but that they contain some mistake seems pretty certain.

Chapuys does not appear to have got hold of the letters written by Marillac to Francis, but those of the King to his ambassador seem to have made their way to him, and were transcribed in cipher for the Emperor's benefit. Marillac was wise enough to see that Henry's whole object now was to set Francis and the Emperor by the ears, and the greater the danger of an outbreak between them was, the more affectionate were the terms in which the ambassador was directed

to address his good friend the King of England. His letters of this period, as well as Chapuys's, are full of the sad story of Catharine Howard's misconduct, her trial, and her execution. But what is very curious is, that it was the common talk that Henry would take Anne of Cleves again into favour, and Francis actually commissioned his ambassador to do his best to bring this about, whilst, what is more curious still, the ambassador of the Duke of Cleves was instructed also to further Anne's marriage with the King, and to thank him for his conduct towards her in the past. Marillac adds that, upon this being mentioned to the Council, Gardiner, at that time Bishop of Winchester, had very angrily replied that nothing would ever induce his master to take the lady back, as her repudiation had been grounded on such good reasons.

Whilst Francis was thus anxious to keep on good terms with Henry, Chapuys was doing all he could to thwart the French king. On December 18 he enclosed Francis's ciphered despatch to Marillac, which he had obtained in the surreptitious manner described above, and informed Charles of his anxiety to have an interview with the King, who refused to do any business, occupying his whole time in diversions to relieve his mind of the disappointment caused by the revelation of the Queen's malpractices. Chapuys says that he held that an interview was more necessary now than ever, 'in order to bring him over to your Majesty's side, owing to the secret practices of the French in every quarter, with which, besides the information obtained elsewhere, I have lately been made sufficiently acquainted by the Queen Regent of Flanders' (p. 419). Probably another copy of the poor French king's letter is at Brussels, for Chapuys enclosed a duplicate to the Queen of Hungary.

The volume we have been reviewing reaches only to the end of April. A few months later, on August 10, the French king wrote from Lyons to his very dear and much-loved brother and perpetual ally the King of England, in reply to Henry's letter of pretended dissatisfaction at the breaking out of war between the Emperor and Francis. In this letter he endeavours to justify the warlike attitude he had been obliged to assume. Probably nothing under the circumstances could have better pleased the King of England. But though this volume does not reach so far as this, it is full of matters which formed the real or ostensible causes of the outbreak. As regards this point the State Papers contained in this volume do not supply much additional information. The first preliminary to an outbreak of hostilities was the murder of

189
An
Fre
and
to
and
Ver
wea
the
New
Geo
mili
thro
edit
the
plan
the
July
as re
was
acqu
busin
tratic
Fran
T
The
Papa
comm
part
betwe
in the
toward
deavo
more
Of cou
land, c
or no
serve
preced
his ow
most c
the sor
already
when
cardina
Ascani

Antonio Rincon, a renegade Spaniard in the service of the French king, who was employed on a mission to the Sultan, and of Cesare Fragoso, who was engaged on a similar errand to the Venetian Republic. The two met in Piedmont, and as they were descending the River Po on their way to Venice were arrested and assassinated by some armed men wearing masks, who, it was supposed, were instigated by the Marquis of Guasto, who, however, disclaimed the deed. Nevertheless Francis, in retaliation, immediately arrested George of Austria, a natural son of the late Emperor Maximilian, and so an uncle of the Emperor's, who was travelling through France on his way from Spain to Flanders. The editor gives his opinion in the introduction (p. xxix) that the arrest and assassination of the two French agents was planned by the governor of Milan with the full knowledge of the Emperor. But the Marquis's letter to the Emperor dated July 7, 1541, shows that whatever may have been the truth as regards his own intervention in the matter, the Emperor was not privy to it, though perhaps he was quite willing to acquiesce in the affair when it was accomplished. The whole business was by common consent referred to the Pope's arbitration. Meanwhile the Archbishop of Valencia was kept by Francis under confinement.

There is one other prominent figure in these despatches. The Cardinal Alessandro Farnese had succeeded to the Papal throne four years before the time at which these papers commence, and almost his last action, as recorded in the last part of the preceding volumes, had been his intervention between the Emperor and the French king, which resulted in the ten years' truce, so soon to be annulled. His attitude towards the different courts of Europe was that of one endeavouring to keep the peace of all Christian Powers, in order more successfully to resist the growing power of the Turk. Of course he was the inveterate enemy of the King of England, of whose return to the Papal obedience there was little or no hope in any quarter. But second to his desire to preserve the peace of Christendom, if indeed it did not take precedence of all other thoughts, was his desire to aggrandize his own family. He had several grandchildren, of whom the most conspicuous in this volume are Ottavio and Vittoria, the son and daughter of his natural son Pier Luigi. He had already created Alessandro, their elder brother, a cardinal when he was only fifteen years old, at his first creation of cardinals in 1534, at which time he had also created Guido Ascanio Sforza, another grandson by his natural daughter

Costanza. Another grandson, named Ranucio, was afterwards, in 1545, made a cardinal at the age of fifteen. This last creation is beyond the period occupied by this volume, but it illustrates the policy, which Paul III. never lost sight of, of promoting the Farnese family. The method adopted for the most part during the period we are treating of was by projecting marriages first between Ottavio and Margaret, the natural daughter of the Emperor, the Dowager Duchess of Florence, and secondly, between Vittoria and three or four suitors, all of which latter attempts proved abortive. With regard to his grandson he was more successful, and the marriage between the boy of fourteen and the lady who, though a widow, was but little older, was accomplished November 3, 1538, and was the cause of much uneasiness. But it furthered the Pope's policy both as regards the advancement of the Farnese family and confirming his alliance with the Emperor, who was at that time more to be trusted than Francis in respect to the resistance of the Turkish advance in Europe. The details of the quarrels of the youthful pair, and the profligacy of Ottavio, who seemed to have gone even beyond the excesses of his father, occupy a good deal of space in this volume. The poor Dowager Duchess of Florence was probably more sinned against than sinning, for she had protested against the marriage, and for some time refused cohabitation with her boy husband. The details of their life, as given by the editor, are undoubtedly disgusting enough, though it is plain that he has abstained from translating the original, and in other cases has altogether omitted many of the particulars narrated in the letters. Still, whatever were the relations of the married couple, the Pope had secured the ends he had in view, viz. the allying his family with that of the Emperor, and so far securing Charles's interest in his future proceedings both as regards the assembling of a General Council and conducting the operations against the infidel. In fact the Emperor pretty well saw through the Pope when he observed that he was following in the footsteps of Clement VII., 'who, whilst treating of a marriage between his own niece with a relation of our own, all of a sudden had her married to the second son of Francis' (p. 287), and complains that his Holiness wished to 'compel us to make him some offer to be accepted by him, if preferable or more convenient than the Lorraine marriage, so as to bind us to gratitude by saying that out of respect for us he had refused the other, which seemed to him far more advantageous' (p. 288).

As regards the marriage of his granddaughter Vittoria

he was less successful. Various proposals for the marriage with persons in connexion with France came to nothing, and, strange as it may appear, even as late as December 1840 Chapuys informs the Emperor that Henry had said to him that the French king 'is soliciting a marriage between Monsieur d'Angoulême and the granddaughter of the Pope, with what intentions God only knows' (p. 298), and as it happened the Pope had to wait many years before his granddaughter was married to Guidobaldo della Rovere, Duke of Urbino.

The relations of the Pope and the Emperor seem at times somewhat strained. In September 1538 the Emperor announces his own safe return from the conferences at Nice and Aigues Mortes to Valladolid, and congratulates his Holiness on his own safe arrival at Rome. At the very beginning of the year 1539 the Pope notifies to the Emperor the fact that he has excommunicated the King of England, and begs his co-operation in the way of the Emperor's forbidding any trading intercourse between the dominions of the two princes; but the Emperor, in his reply of March 17, avoids all allusion to this request, and, with large professions of his steadfast adhesion and submission to the Apostolic See, refers his Holiness to the Marquis de Aguilar, his ambassador, to whose words entire credence may be given as if they fell from the Emperor's own lips. Later in the year Paul writes his condolences on the death of the Empress Isabella, and speaks in the highest terms of the young Dowager Duchess of Florence, who, it appears, the Pope is desirous to have it thought that she had become reconciled to her boy husband, his grandson Ottavio Farnese, though after this there must have been violent altercations between them, the young bride being extremely desirous for a separation. The whole affair is most disgraceful to all the parties concerned in it.

There are other interesting particulars in this volume which we must pass by unnoticed; but we must not conclude without making our protest against the slovenly way in which the work has been produced and the trouble it has caused us in correcting its many mistakes. We really think it is not too much to expect a Spaniard to know that *Pasqua* in Spanish means Christmas and Pentecost as well as Easter, and that an editor of State Papers should know that *Pasques fleuris* means Palm Sunday, if indeed the ordinary knowledge of the Church's calendar could not save him from the blunder of supposing that Easter could fall in June or December.

ART. VIII.—SWIFT'S LIFE AND WRITINGS.

1. *Life of Jon. Swift, Dean of St. Patrick's.* By HENRY CRAIK, M.A. (London, 1882.)
2. *Swift: the Mystery of his Life and Love.* By JAMES HAY, Minister of the Parish of Kirn, Author of *Johnson's Characteristics*, &c. (London, 1891.)
3. *Swift's Works.* Edited by Sir WALTER SCOTT. 19 vols. 2nd edit. (Edinburgh, 1824.)

THE history of Swift's life presents more than one problem which admits of no definite solution, and it will always have a singular fascination for the least curious reader—the fascination of a paradox. It is strange enough that the child of a needy steward to the Irish Inns of Court should rise to be the intimate of all that was greatest in England, but not stranger than the caprice of fame, which has made *Gulliver's Travels* familiar to mankind as a story-book for children. Swift's life is involved in a web of contradictions. No man ever expressed in plainer language what he had to say, no man ever hated mystery more heartily, no autobiography was ever so complete a revelation of self as the *Journal to Stella*; yet there is no more baffling pursuit in literature than the attempt to track out the recesses of Swift's mind. Finally, though no man was ever more vigorously hated in his lifetime than was Swift, yet it is probable that Steele or the Duchess of Marlborough would have resented the imputations which latter-day criticism has heaped upon his memory.

The fate of his reputation has been chequered as his own. Shortly after his death Lord Orrery published his *Remarks*, in which he discusses Swift's character with an insufferable condescension. Johnson, in one of the worst of his *Lives*, tempered an unconcealed aversion with grudging praise; Sir Walter Scott prefixed to his edition a sketch of Swift that has never been surpassed (though it needs to be supplemented), conceived in a generous, manly, and sensible spirit. Jeffrey, in reviewing it, took Scott to task for his partiality, and launched a diatribe in his most rancorous style against the man whom he stigmatized as a political bravo and self-seeking turncoat. Macaulay, writing with fuller knowledge, outdid Jeffrey in the violence of his language, and unpardonably misrepresented facts, insisting, like Jeffrey, on what he was pleased to style Swift's political apostasy. Thackeray followed with his lecture, from which probably nine people in

NGS.

HENRY

ES HAY,
on's Cha-

19 vols.

problem
ays have
the fasci-
child of a
to be the
stranger
s Travels
swift's life
expressed
ver hated
so com-
t there is
tempt to
ough no
than was
of Marl-
ch latter-

his own.
marks, in
able con-
ives, tem-
aise; Sir
swift that
emented),
Jeffrey,
ality, and
ainst the
self-seek-
dge, out-
ardonably
t he was
eray fol-
people in

ten derive their ideas of Swift's character; a criticism which, containing, it is true, passages of singular beauty and insight, must, upon the whole, be ranked as one of the most unbalanced judgments ever penned. The tide of public opinion was turned by Mr. Forster's unhappily interrupted work, whose tone suggests panegyric rather than apology. Mr. Leslie Stephen, in his short monograph, writes of his author with a genuine esteem; and Mr. Craik, publishing what must be considered the standard life of Swift, showed an admiration for his character equal to that which none can deny to his genius.

Mr. Hay's book is the latest contribution to the mass of literature which has accumulated round the name and work of Swift. Its avowed object is to vindicate the Dean's character against the attacks of Macaulay, Jeffrey, and Thackeray, whom he oddly enough lumps together as 'three Whig literary lords.' Mr. Hay is a very painstaking student, and his work shows close acquaintance not only with his author but with the work of previous writers upon Swift. However, the minister of the parish of Kirn has freely admitted upon page 294 that 'creative geniuses in all ages of the world's history have borrowed from one another'—Swift, Shakespeare, Pope, Dickens, Johnson, Carlyle; and that he himself 'does not pretend to be immaculate in this respect.' Although we do not quite agree with Mr. Hay when he declares that Thackeray was unable to understand Swift, we must attribute to him well-deserved praise for having in several instances proved the falsity of the colours in which the great Victorian satirist represented his greater predecessor; for instance, on page 187, where he disposes of Thackeray's statement that Swift advised Gay to go into the Church. The misfortune is, that it is inconceivable how people in general should either cease to read Thackeray's lecture or continue to read Mr. Hay's book. We feel kindly towards the minister for his staunch championship and his 'sæva indignatio' against the guilty three, 'Whigs all of them'; but we cannot overlook the fact that out of six Latin quotations which occur, four are misprinted—grievously misprinted—a fifth is from Virgil but written as prose; and the sixth is our old friend 'cui bono?' in the familiar misapprehension of it. We might have forgiven Mr. Hay—considering his nationality—for manifesting a preference for the 'practical wisdom and sententious brevity' of the 'Aphorisms' above all Swift's other work; we might have laughed to find the saying, 'Half-a-dozen fools are prating in a coffee-house and presently think their own noise about their

ears is made by the world,' headed (in capitals) as EXAGGERATION OF SUBURBAN INTERESTS; but when we see one of Swift's happiest phrases, 'A nice man is a man of nasty ideas,' labelled as 'The Social Favourite,' we pariously suspect Mr. Hay of knowing no English but the tongue, say, of Professor Bain.

We shall have subsequently to advert to Mr. Hay's answer to some of the vexed questions in this history; for the present we proceed briefly to the main purpose of this article.

Swift's career falls naturally into three parts: a discipleship of thirty-two years which developed in him the qualities, moral and intellectual, that characterise his work; sixteen years' activity as an English publicist; and lastly, thirty years passed at the Deanery of St. Patrick's, during which he was absolutely his own master, working for no ends but those he himself selected, and by no other means than his pen alone.

The late Mr. Forster's life covered the first two stages in Swift's history; of his English political career Mr. Leslie Stephen has given a succinct and admirably clear account; it is the especial credit of Mr. Craik to have elaborated an account of Swift's life which contains ample information on almost every stage of it; and he is not to blame if the variety of matter has refused to blend into any dramatic presentment.

Most of the miscellaneous contributions to the study of Swift deal with the problems presented by his private history or his political affinities, somewhat to the neglect of his permanent work in pure literature; the present article is an attempt to sketch in connexion with the periods in Swift's life the literary output of each, only discussing biographical questions where a solution seems to be suggested by his writings.

His training was a most untender one, toughening the fibre of his character, but dwarfing and distorting its softer shoots. Swift never had a home; a loss absolutely immeasurable in its results on a nature like his. He was a posthumous son; and the pressing dread of poverty added to the sorrows of his mother's widowed pregnancy. A child born under such auspices could scarcely have a happy nature; his boyhood was embittered by the grudging charity of relations at whose charge he was educated; and poverty soured his life in college. But poverty taught him the lesson that money means liberty; a lesson that Irishmen are slow to learn. Nor was Swift an Irishman save by the accident of birth; he came of a Yorkshire stock, and it was the Yorkshireman in him that wrote to Bolingbroke, 'I have made a

maxim, my lord, that should be writ in letters of diamonds, that a wise man ought to have money in his head but not in his heart.'¹ There is a less admirable trace of Yorkshire, too, in his brutality of manner and aggressive independence; and no imputation was more fiercely resented by Swift than that of Irish blood. But in Ireland he was born and bred; in spite of his English associations his wit is racy of the soil. 'L'accent du pays où l'on est né demeure plus longtemps dans l'esprit que dans le langage,' is a shrewd saying of Rochefoucauld, an authority whom Swift rarely disputed: and indeed Swift's memory and works are the peculiar glory and heritable delight of the people he so scornfully served.

In 1688 the Revolution and attendant fears of a Protestant massacre drove him to England; and at the age of twenty-one he exchanged poverty for dependence, entering Sir William Temple's household in an almost menial capacity. His ability soon promoted him from a mere clerk to be a sort of literary secretary to his employer; and here he served his apprenticeship to politics in a seclusion that commanded a wide view of the busy world. We learn from himself how Temple displayed for his benefit the seamy side of those 'jugglers' tricks which we call deep designs and politics;² and under the veteran diplomat's roof Swift met and conversed with the leading men of the day, including even King William himself.

Yet, to his proud and sensitive spirit, dependency was intolerable, and after five years' residence at Moorpark he decided on taking Holy orders. It was a step Swift had early meditated. No candid writer would credit him with a vocation for the priestly office, but it is monstrous for Thackeray to represent him as 'strangled in his bands.' Swift had to choose between the gown and a dependency such as was Gay's lot through life; he chose the Church, and no man ever acted on a distincter conception of the clerical duties and clerical privileges. He was ordained in 1694, and preferred at once to the prebend of Kilroot, a little seaside parish in the diocese of Connor. Here he passed a year and a half, in which he wrote probably most of the *Tale of a Tub*; and fell in love with a young lady, one Miss Waring, a selection dictated probably more by proximity than by the fitness of things. He was refused, and this amongst other reasons may have induced him to accede to Temple's request and return to Moorpark, rather as an equal than as a dependant. Mr. Craik has done good service in clearing up the relations

¹ *Works*, xvii. 252.

² 'Ode to Temple,' *Works*, xiv. 16.

between Swift and Temple, and has insisted strongly on the advance in Swift's position, secured by the mere fact of his having once shaken himself loose from dependency.

Swift, gladly as it would seem, resumed the old life with its opportunities for study and practice in composition. He had 'writ and burnt and writ again upon all manner of subjects, more than perhaps any man in England,' he tells a correspondent.¹ Some early Pindaric odes escaped the flames, verse more villanous than Cicero's; he might have been a bishop 'si sic omnia dixisset.' But in 1697 the *Battle of the Books* appeared, not in print but circulated among Temple's coterie; and already in the fable of the 'Spider and the Bee,' Swift gave evidence of a prose style superior to any that had yet been known in English.

In 1699 Temple died, leaving Swift his literary executor, recompensed for the task by a legacy of 100*l.* and the profits accruing from the sale of his remains, which amounted to about 500*l.* The promises of preferment of which Somers, Halifax, Sunderland, and the King himself had not been sparing, proved barren; till in 1700 Lord Berkeley, going to Ireland as viceroy, proposed to Swift to accompany him as chaplain and secretary. At the very outset of his new career a piece of sharp practice deprived him of the secretaryship in favour of one Bushe; and when, in 1701, Lord Berkeley presented him with the joint livings of Laracor and Rathbigan, worth 200*l.* a year, Swift neither was nor had any occasion to be grateful. The duties of the post were not sufficient to hinder him from spending nearly half his time in England; and it was in England that he published anonymously, in 1704, his *Tale of a Tub* and *Battle of the Books*, which together form the masterpiece of that apprenticeship to letters which ended with Temple's death.

Many have commented on the late fruitage of Swift's genius; but the truth is that such work, depending as it does on long experience and minute observation of humanity, could not in the nature of things be produced by a young man. Even between these first satirical works and all his subsequent productions there exists the broad distinction that the former deal with ideas, the latter with actions. The *Battle of the Books* is a scholar's *jeu d'esprit*; the *Tale of a Tub* is a satire of vast range and exuberant vigour, yet it is chiefly the meditative satire of a literary man who reads in history, philosophy, and theology, the record of the follies of mankind. The style too savours more of theory than practice; it is

¹ To Rev. John Kendall, February 11, 1691-2; *Works*, xv. 252.

more leisurely, more ornate, more harmonious, and less incisive than in the later works. In such a passage as the following we catch something of the rolling music of the seventeenth century :—

‘And whereas the mind of man, when he gives the spur and bridle to his thoughts, does never stop, but naturally sallies out into both extremes of high and low, of good and evil, his first flight of fancy commonly transports him to ideas of what is most perfect, finished, and exalted, till, having soared out of his own reach and sight, not well perceiving how near the frontiers of height and depth border upon each other, with the same course and wing he falls down plump into the lowest bottom of things, like one who travels the east into the west, or like a straight line drawn by its own length into a circle. Whether a tincture of malice in our natures makes us fond of furnishing every bright idea with its reverse, or whether reason, reflecting upon the sum of things, can, like the sun, serve only to enlighten one half of the globe, leaving the other half by necessity under shade and darkness, or whether fancy, flying up to the imagination of what is highest and best, becomes over-short, and spent, and weary, and suddenly falls, *like a dead bird of paradise*, to the ground ; or whether, after all these metaphysical conjectures, I have not entirely missed the true reason ; the proposition, however, which has stood me in so much circumstance is altogether true, that as the most uncivilized parts of mankind have some way or other climbed up into the conception of a God or Supreme Power, so they have seldom forgot to provide their fears with certain ghastly notions, which, instead of better, have served them pretty tolerably for a devil.’¹

Yet with this elaborate style there is equal clearness, the same original inspiration, the same pregnancy of thought, and the astonishing fertility of invention that surprises us with turns like this :—

‘A grey critic has been certainly a green one, the perfections and acquirements of his age being only the improved talent of his youth, like hemp, which some naturalists inform us is bad for suffocation though taken but in the seed.’²

Of this ingenuity the book displays more, perhaps, than all Swift's other writings, and this seems to account for Johnson's strong preference of it. Yet to many modern readers it is the least satisfactory of Swift's works. We are less aware in it of what Mr. Birrell has so happily called ‘the strong background of gloomy personality ;’ it has not the subtle irony of the *Argument against abolishing Christianity* ; the part which deals with the Dissenters is disgustingly coarse, though unhappily far outdone in this respect by others of his

¹ *Works*, x. 155.

² *Ibid.* x. 105.

writings; the satire upon the doctrines of the Roman Church is dull, and merits better than anything else in the book the name of profane, for no hatred of abuses can make it other than profanity to break coarse jests on what to countless thousands are solemn mysteries and hallowed by the most venerable associations. Swift, scrupulously decent as we know him to have been in the observances of his own Church, had no sort of sympathy for the forms religion took in others, a deficiency impossible to a man in whom the religious instinct was dominant. His sense of an overruling power seems only to have become real to him in times of great personal sorrow, and the prayers written for use at Stella's bedside¹ (if it be not an impiety to peep and scrutinize into such utterances) are inspired by a submission of judgment rather than loving trust. As to the nature of his beliefs we are left in the dark; his thoughts on religion every man will interpret his own way.

'I am in all opinions to believe according to my own impartial reason, which I am bound to inform and improve as far as my capacity and opportunities will permit.'²

'I am not answerable to God for the doubts that arise in my own breast, since they are the consequence of that reason which He hath planted in me if I take care to conceal those doubts from others, if I use my best endeavours to check them, and if they have no influence on the conduct of my life.'³

'The want of belief is a defect that ought to be concealed when it cannot be overcome.'⁴

Swift had a tremendous sense of legality. The individual's duty was to conform himself to the laws he lived under, which to that end should be simple and rational. Hence, though in his Sermon on the Trinity he recognizes mystery (by ordinance established) as an essential part of our creed, he disliked mystery; and the *Tale of a Tub* is written to satirize what he considered the irrational excrescences on belief existing in the Romish Church. Hence, again, he is an enemy to all anarchy, whether he is satirizing the Dissenters' pretensions to inward light, or the disorderly corruption that made Ireland a chaos.

Hence finally he had a strong idea of the dignity of his own profession as the repositories of religious law, and did not spare those of his brethren whom he thought ill supporters of it. The following is taken from his *Project for the Advancement of Religion*, a curious proposal for making men virtuous by compulsory church-going:—

¹ *Works*, ix. 297.

² *Ibid.* viii. 55.

³ *Ibid.* viii. 53.

⁴ *Ibid.* p. 54.

'Without the least intention to offend the clergy, I cannot but think that, through a mistaken notion and practice, they prevent themselves from doing much service, which otherwise might lie in their power to religion and virtue—I mean by affecting so much to converse with each other, and caring so little to mingle with the laity. They have their particular coffee-houses, where they generally appear in clusters; a single divine hardly dares to show his person among numbers of fine gentlemen, or, if he happens to fall into such company, he is silent and suspicious, in continual apprehension that some pert man of pleasure should break an unmannerly jest and render him ridiculous.'¹

It is interesting to contrast with the *Tale of a Tub* Swift's famous attack on irreligion. Published only two years later, the *Argument against abolishing Christianity* is conceived in a wholly different style. Never did Swift use his irony with more refined skill. It would seem as if he wished to convince those who accused his former work of irreligion that the same arts might with deadly effect carry the war into the enemy's camp. Certainly the shallow and pretentious scepticism which was then rampant never met with a more scathing treatment:—

'First, one great advantage proposed by the abolishing of Christianity is that it would very much enlarge and establish liberty of conscience, that great bulwark of our nation and of the Protestant religion, which is still too much limited by priestcraft, notwithstanding all the good intentions of the legislature, as we have lately found by a severe instance; for it is confidently reported that two young gentlemen of real hopes, bright wit, and profound judgment, who upon a thorough examination of causes and effects, and by the mere force of natural abilities, without the least tincture of learning, having made a discovery that there was no God, and generously communicating their thoughts for the good of the public, were some time ago, by an unparalleled severity and I know not what obsolete law, broke for blasphemy.'²

Yet even here the finest stroke of satire, the wonderful touch about the Protestant religion, is aimed not at open infidelity but at spurious professions of religion.

How far removed is this from the Rabelaisian extravagances of the earlier work! It is the man of the world who speaks throughout in the easy quiet tone of good society. The change in Swift's life had qualified him for this method. Accompanying Lord Berkeley to London in 1701, he found England in a commotion over the projected impeachment of the Whig peers by a Tory House of Commons. Swift published, to meet the crisis, his first political

¹ *Works*, viii. 93.

² *Ibid.* viii. 64.

tract, *The Dissensions in Athens and Rome*, still writing as a scholar rather than a politician. But the academic form fell in well with the taste of that age, and Swift's classical parallels excited considerable enthusiasm. The doctrines he there formulated were those which he had imbibed from Temple, and to which he was constant through his whole career. The balance of power between the Crown, Lords, and Commons, the hatred of *dominatio plebis*, and the disapproval of blind party spirit, were the articles of faith of a philosophic Revolution Whig. 'As to myself,' he writes in 1732 to Lady Betty Germaine, 'I am of the old Whig principles without the modern articles and refinements.'¹ The question destined to separate Swift from the Whigs was as yet in the background.

The first decade of the seventeenth century probably included the happiest part of Swift's life. Then, for the first time in England, he tasted literary and social success; while in Ireland a new feature was added to his existence. During his absence in 1701 Esther Johnson, or, as Swift loved to call her, Stella, Temple's *protégée* and Swift's own pupil, with her companion Mrs. Dingley, came to settle at Laracor. So began that strange connexion which was only broken by death twenty-four years later. During that time the ladies, while Swift was in Ireland, lived in lodgings near him, and, in his absence, occupied his house. But it would appear that Swift and Stella never met save in the presence of a third person; and what was the precise nature of their relation will never be known with certainty.

In 1704 Swift was charged with a mission that brought him into official relation with the Whig ministry. He was entrusted with a request from the Irish bishops for the remission of the royal tenths and firstfruits to the Irish Church; the annual value of these Mr. Craik puts at about 3,000*l.* a year. He was met with ready promises of support, and led to entertain hopes of preferment so considerable that he admits his disappointment when the see of Waterford went to another man. But no positive result came of the protestations, and the shallow diplomacy of lying courtiers savagely incensed Swift, who took it as an insult to his intelligence. Already his party allegiance had been strained. New factors had been introduced into the political situation. The Whigs, who had identified themselves with the war, were supported by Marlborough's triumphant career; but in home politics strong forces were brought to bear against them. The Dissenters and Roman Catholics alike were clamouring for the repeal

¹ *Works*, xviii. 69.

of the
the Cr
and to
to 1704
Tatlers
on relig
he took
Craik s
allegian
It v
Englan
Dissent
but to
structiv
upon m
Thoug
defendi
this to
Church
in 1710
and So
says, 'a
he acce
St. Joh
Har
him a s
to win S
prompt
took ca
new sup
serve hi
he confe
the sens
was soo
stronges
romantic
the fasci
but not
of great
there wa
Harley
qualities
age of c
valued.
even Bol
VOL. 2

of the sacramental test necessary to qualify for office under the Crown. The Tory party had allied itself to the Church; and to this side Swift's inclinations drew him. From 1704 to 1708, though he was busy with Addison and Steele over *Tatlers*, Bickerstaff-baiting, and the more serious pamphlets on religion, he had not a word to say on politics. But in 1708 he took his side. The *Letter on the Sacramental Test* is, Mr. Craik says, though anonymous, 'a clear renunciation of party allegiance.'

It was followed up by the *Sentiments of a Church of England Man*, in which Swift formulates his views as to the Dissenters. They are to have toleration, for thought is free; but to recognize them as members of the community is destructive to the idea of a united Church and State. 'I look upon myself, in the capacity of a clergyman,' says he in his *Thoughts of Religion*, 'to be one appointed by Providence for defending a post assigned me' (viii. 55), and Swift meant by this to guard the temporal as well as spiritual interests of the Church. After these utterances Swift proceeded to London in 1710, when Godolphin's ministry was tottering to its fall, and Somers, Halifax, and Sunderland 'caught at him,' he says, 'as drowning men catch at straws.' Headless of them, he accepted willingly the dexterous advances of Harley and St. John.

Harley, with the fine instinct for management which made him a successful parliamentarian, took at once the right way to win Swift. He said nothing of personal preferment, but promptly carried through the business of the firstfruits, and took care that it should appear to be a concession to his new supporter. Then, by allowing Swift every occasion to serve his new friends and revenge himself on his old party, he conferred on him the reward dearest to a self-made man, the sense of his own power and importance. The connexion was soon cemented by personal friendship, for Swift the strongest of all ties. He conceived for the Lord Treasurer a romantic admiration which is now hard to understand; but the fascination which held two such men as Swift and Arbuthnot could have only proceeded from a nature not devoid of greatness. 'I always said to you,' writes Arbuthnot, 'that there was only one Dragon in *rerum natura*' (xvi. 224). Harley at least, to reverse the familiar epigram, the qualities of his defects. And one virtue, rare in that golden age of corruption, he possessed—the one which Swift most valued. He resigned office as poor as he took it up; not even Bolingbroke, in his most spiteful letters, hints the con-

trary. It is noticeable, too, that Swift, terribly keen though his insight was when guided by resentment, was not a trustworthy judge of character, and oftener erred on the side of favour. He confesses to having wasted sympathy on the Duchess of Hamilton's noisy grief after her husband's murder; and he got into trouble by introducing to English friends a roguish curate, named Pilkington, and his disreputable wife, who has left such a sketch of Swift as Becky Sharp might have written. In later years, too, he tolerated the pedantic fop Lord Orrery, who subsequently defaced his memory.

Harley's action soon amply justified itself. Before a year was out the new ministry were met by a strong coalition of the Whigs united to a deserter from the Tory camp, the Earl of Nottingham. By a singularly unblushing compromise Nottingham consented to help the Whigs back to power, which meant a continuance of the war and further aggrandisement of Marlborough; they, on the other hand, swallowed their principles bodily, and introduced an Act forbidding occasional conformity, thus depriving Dissenters and Romanists of the only means by which they could qualify for office. The coalition overreached itself; the Bill was allowed to pass; and the Dissenters, who had been cajoled into supporting a Bill to effect their political annihilation, now came cringing to Lord Oxford. The Whigs were left with nothing but the popularity of the war and Marlborough's fame to stand on; and it was at this juncture that the ministers found what it meant to have on their side a writer who could play to any gallery. Swift had carried on a ceaseless paper warfare; he wrote the party's ballads and its state papers as well. In his lampoons he showed a marvellous skill in selecting the deadliest weapon and the weakest point for attack. In his serious papers, the *Examiners* and the rest, he was supreme in marshalling facts. They have never been surpassed as pieces of polemical writing; there is no verbiage, no direct appeal to the sentiments, even irony is generally excluded; there is nothing but arrangement, and the facts speak for themselves. Of these tracts the best and the most important was the *Conduct of the Allies*, published just after Marlborough's return to London in 1711. It sold by thousands, and by preparing the mind of the nation for the parliamentary struggle that was impending, undoubtedly decided the struggle itself. The war was no longer popular; and when it was known that Marlborough and his secretary had, in Mr. Craik's words, 'been proved to have received commissions for which the precedent was doubtful, and for which even precedent could

hard
Mar
the

mon
min
siti
John
host
were
with
he l
hero
him
Stel
his l
writ
ever
it th
page
Mr. S
he q
Princ

a lon
footm
it; b
with s

On t

' y
must
days
those
I had
thous
wished

T
recor
touch
spons
school
his g

¹ F
and cu

hardly serve as a defence,' popular feeling shifted round. Marlborough was deprived of his offices, and a majority in the Lords secured by the creation of twelve new peers.

At last Swift breathed freely; he had been living for months under the apprehension of death itself should the ministry fall. Henceforward the danger was not from opposition so much as from want of cohesion. Harley and St. John, now Lords Oxford and Bolingbroke, were naturally hostile; and it was chiefly by Swift's good offices that they were kept together at all. He lived in the closest intimacy with both; nor is there wanting evidence to prove that, though he loved Oxford, he admired his rival: 'It is you were my hero, but the other never was' (xvii. 274). Swift writes to him in later days, and it appears clearly from the *Journal to Stella* that his judgment would have advised him to throw in his lot with Bolingbroke. In this extraordinary record all writers have recognized the most complete self-revelation ever penned; Swift is his own Boswell and more. Nor does it throw more light on the writer than on the time; on one page we have Prince Eugene's appearance at court, 'where Mr. Secretary, who introduced him, walked so near him that he quite screened him from me with his great periwig'; the Prince himself, in a tie-wig, satirically apologetic:—

'Now, says the Prince, I knew not what to do; for I never had a long periwig in my life; and I have sent to all my valets and footmen to see whether any of them have any that I might borrow it; but none of them has any. Was not this spoken very greatly with some sort of contempt' (ii. 464).

On the next:—

'Well; then come, let us see this letter; if I must answer it, I must. What's here now?'¹ Yes, faith, I lamented my birthday two days after; and that's all; and you rhyme, Madam Stella; were those verses made upon my birthday? Faith, when I read them, I had them running in my head all the day, and said them over a thousand times; they drank your health in all their glasses, and wished, &c. I could not get them out of my head' (ii. 465).

The *Journal*, as even Jeffrey has admitted, is more than a record, it is Swift's best apology. The part he played was a touchstone of character. He had great power, and an irresponsible position. Ministers allowed him to rate them like schoolboys; the ambassadors of France and Spain entreated his good offices with Oxford and Bolingbroke; he was not

¹ His custom was to read Job iii.: 'After this opened Job his mouth, and cursed his day.'

more dreaded for his satire than he was courted for his personal charm. Duchesses sued in form for the honour of his acquaintance, and not even the hatred his pen excited could outlast the friendship by which the foremost men of the day thought it a distinction to be bound to him. Arbuthnot, writing to him years later, deploras the absence of a friend in whom good nature and sincerity are the qualities he selects to praise. It was the boast of his later years that he employed his credit, not for his own ends, but to advance merit wherever he found it, irrespective of party. The ministers reproached him because 'he never came to them without a Whig in his sleeve.'¹ Of his old friends, Steele was the only one with whom Swift had an open breach; and in that case the rupture was due to gross discourtesy and unreason on Steele's part. Literary jealousy never touched him. On the contrary, he lost no opportunity of securing to talent a means of subsistence. There is no more touching passage in his *Journal* than that which relates the death of young Harrison. The whole case throws an interesting light on the history of the times.

'*Jan. 30th, 1712-13.*—I hear little Harrison is come over; it was he I sent to Utrecht. He is now Queen's secretary to the embassy. . . . I long to see the little brat, my own creature. His pay is in all a thousand pounds a year, and they have never paid him a groat, though I have teased their hearts out. He must be three or four hundred pounds in debt at least' (iii. 105).

'*Jan. 31st.*—Harrison was with me this morning. We talked three hours, and then I carried him to court. When we went down to the door of my lodging I found a coach waited for him. I chid him for it; but he whispered me, it was impossible to do otherwise. And in the coach he told me he had not one farthing in his pocket to pay it; and therefore took the coach for the whole day, and intended to borrow money somewhere or other. So there was the Queen's minister, entrusted in affairs of the greatest importance, without a shilling in his pocket to pay a coach.'

'*Feb. 12th.*—I found a letter on my table last night to tell me that poor little Harrison was ill, and desired to see me at night; but it was late, and I could not go till to-day. I went in the morning, and found him mighty ill, and got thirty guineas for him from Lord Bolingbroke, and an order for one hundred pounds from the Treasury, to be paid him to-morrow.'

'*Feb. 14th.*—I took Parnell this morning, and we walked to see poor Harrison. I had the one hundred pounds in my pocket. I told Parnell I was afraid to knock at the door: my mind misgave me. I did knock, and his man, in tears, told me his master was dead an hour before. Think what grief this is to me! I went to his mother, and have been ordering things for his funeral with as

¹ *Works*, xvi. 350.

little cost as possible, to-morrow at ten at night. . . . I could not dine with Lord Treasurer, nor anywhere else ; but got a bit of meat towards evening. No loss ever grieved me so much, . . . poor creature ! . . . Adieu. I send this away to-night, and I am sorry it must go while I am in so much grief' (iii. 113).

But the conclusive proof of Swift's disinterestedness is shown in his relations with Oxford. It was not the expectation of preferment that bound him ; for on all sides he was assured that Oxford's negligence alone delayed his promotion. The truth was that the Queen would not hear of ecclesiastical dignity for the author of the *Tale of a Tub* ; and the Duchess of Somerset, the victim of one of Swift's bitterest lampoons, confirmed her in her opinion. But it was Oxford's invariable policy to disoblige by a refusal rather than sacrifice the appearance of power by confessing an inability to grant. Pressure was, however, brought to bear, and finally, after weeks of suspense, Swift was made Dean of St. Patrick's, a title which, since then, sounds as familiar as Archbishop of Canterbury.

The manner of giving was ungracious enough, and Swift did not conceal his aversion to spending or ending his days in Ireland. Yet he never once reproached Oxford or Oxford's memory ; and when the final crash came, Oxford, leaving the court in disgrace, wrote a letter where tasteless trivialities oddly mingle with pathos, to entreat that his friend would accompany him into retirement. Swift, who might most blamelessly have thrown in his lot with Bolingbroke, was preparing to follow him when the Queen's death precipitated Bolingbroke into the same ruin. The collapse of the party was complete. Swift retired to Ireland, where he was greeted with a storm of popular clamour on assuming his residence at the deanery ; nor did he return to England for above ten years. The man who had helped to govern England now bounded his power to controlling the cathedral clergy. Writing to Gay ten years later, he says : 'I was three years reconciling myself to the scene and the business to which fortune hath condemned me, and stupidity was what I had recourse to' (xvi. 398). Pope wrote to preach the spurious philosophy *de contemptu mundi et fuga sæculi*, of which he was so fit an exponent ; but Swift angrily retorted on him that Oxford and the Duke of Ormond were in prison, and 'do you suppose I can be easy while their enemies are trying to take off their heads ?

'I nunc et versus tecum meditare canoros' (xvi. 229).

None the less Pope, like many other moralists, spoke truth.

Swift's political ruin sealed his literary fame. Since the *Tale of a Tub* he had written nothing of at all the same importance. He was now driven to pursue literature as an end, not as a means.

It is from the traditions and the writings of this period that the popular estimate of Swift has been formed. He writes now in the fulness of knowledge, as a man who had touched life at almost every point. He writes in bitterness of spirit, the broken advocate of a lost cause. In the stress and excitement of political life he could forget the painful vertigo which had grown upon him with his manhood, and its more terrible threat of final insanity. But the last thirty years of his life were one unbroken slope towards the grave, in which the deaths of friends alone marked the distance traversed. Swift had neither the will nor the power to find repose like Bolingbroke in a self-complacent philosophy. Bolingbroke's fall was broken by a woman's tenderness. Swift refused this consolation. We touch here upon the most inexplicable and fascinating problems in Swift's life, his relations with Stella and Vanessa. There can be no doubt, as Thackeray has beautifully shown, that the *Journal to Stella* is inspired by love, such love as a husband should feel for his young wife. It is easy to say why Swift in 1710 was not Stella's husband. He was poor, he was ambitious, and 'matrimony,' as he wrote later, 'has many children: Repentance, Discord, Spleen, Loathing.'¹ To marry Stella would have been to clog his future career. Swift, with a prudence we had rather praise than imitate, abstained from putting his affection to so severe a test. But in 1715 there was no such reason against marriage; his position for good or evil was definitely settled; he had nothing to hope while the Whigs remained in power; and if his own side came in, he had passed the stage at which a wife might hinder his advancement. Are we to suppose that his feelings towards Stella had changed? or that his aversion to matrimony rested on other grounds than prudential considerations?

As early as 1713 a change is noticeable in the tone of the *Journal*. The long absence had done its estranging work. All the letters in the world could not make Stella Swift's confidant; he could not run to her with his triumphs and his aspirations, his failures and his doubts. Such a confidant was to Swift an indispensable luxury; he found one in the unhappy Vanessa, Miss Hester Vanhomrigh. Swift desired to play the part of preceptor to her; his vanity delighted in the exclusive attentions which a young and attractive woman

¹ *Works*, ix. 241.

bestow
Vaness
meekly
declara
Ireland
unhappy
one dr
Accorde
Vaness
was he
Blacke
was an
his ab
Dublin

It
overloo
acknow

Wh
and it
believin
If he c
of Van
women
Mrs. W
sunnier
of Swift
velopm

Mr.
has eith
previou
Swift a
of stern
I know
Bacchus
to Mar
Stella, h
not fit t
Mr. Ha
absent
before S
Swift's
man as
to keep

¹ The
(August

bestowed on him—a man old enough to be her father. Vanessa, however, did not accept the Platonic relation as meekly as Stella had done: she surprised Swift with a formal declaration of her passion, and insisted on following him to Ireland, where he continued to visit her. The history of her unhappy passion and her premature death is well known; one dramatic detail, however, has been shown to be mythical. According to the common story Swift, on hearing the news of Vanessa's death, fled in anguish to the South of Ireland, and was heard of no more for two months. But a writer in *Blackwood* (May 1876) has pointed out that Swift's journey was arranged previous to the final scandal, and that during his absence he wrote in his usual manner to friends in Dublin.

It is surprising that Mr. Craik should have apparently overlooked this correction, which Mr. Hay has (without acknowledgment) adopted.

Whatever be our view of Swift's relations with Vanessa—and it can hardly be a lenient one—there is no ground for believing that he departed from his principles in the matter. If he did not marry Stella, it was certainly not for the love of Vanessa that he abstained. But his relations with the two women were such as to render both thoroughly miserable. Mrs. Woods in her story's early chapters has brought out the sunnier side of the story with a singularly vivid presentment of Swift's personality. We shall watch with interest her development of the final tragedy.

Mr. Hay, who has gone at great length into these matters, has either evolved from his own wisdom or borrowed from a previous writer a startling theory of the final rupture between Swift and Vanessa.¹ Dr. Delaney, 'a man of high character, of stern veracity, and of pure life,' states, upon what authority I know not, 'that Vanessa, like Ariadne, devoted herself to Bacchus.' From this Mr. Hay infers that when Swift went to Marley Abbey to see Vanessa after she had written to Stella, he found the lady drunk, or, as Mr. Hay says, 'in a state not fit to receive him.' It is difficult to establish a negative. Mr. Hay himself has shown that, though Temple was absent as ambassador at the Hague for a year and a half before Swift's birth, it is impossible to prove that he was not Swift's father. But we may conjecture that so merciless a man as Swift would scarcely have spared Vanessa so far as to keep such a secret. Mr. Hay's object is avowedly to clear

¹ The same idea is found in an article in the *North British Review* (August 1849) called 'Swift and his Biographers.'

'a great and good man of all blame in his relations with these two women.' Therefore to justify Swift's severity towards Vanessa, on Dr. Delaney's authority we are told that Vanessa drank, and therefore Swift must have found her drunk. But if Swift was married to Stella in 1716, as most biographers, including Mr. Craik, believe, Swift's relations with Vanessa were at least calculated to cause pain to both ladies, and did cause it. What shall a fervid admirer do? Why, revive the old theory that Swift and Stella were both natural children of Temple's, and accordingly unable to marry. It is true that Dr. Delaney has recorded that they were married; but in this context we hear nothing of Dr. Delaney's stern veracity. It had been proved long since that the story of the marriage rested only on verbal testimony, and that not first rate. But upon what does this precious theory of a bar of affinity rest? Upon a letter to the *Gentleman's Magazine*, written in 1757, and signed with initials which cannot be identified, in which it is stated that the fact of the affinity, known previously to one person only, was communicated to Swift and Stella when a marriage was projected.

We have not the slightest hesitation in refusing the least iota of credence to this anonymous quidnunc of the last century. It is just such a story as the taste of the eighteenth century delighted to concoct; there was to suggest it the circumstance that both Swift and Stella were brought up in Temple's household. Stella may or not have been treated as Temple's natural daughter—her position is equivocal, Swift's is not. Swift's mother (whom Mr. Hay in his omniscience will scarcely allow to have been his mother) was a kinswoman of Lady Temple's, a fact which Mr. Hay leaves out of sight. Her interest was sufficient to procure for Swift a beggarly employment in Temple's household, and if Temple promoted him to be something better than a mere private secretary, it was because Swift's abilities fitted him for the work. We can spend no more space on Mr. Hay, except to quote a sentence of his own: 'Some of Swift's biographers,' he says in his preface, 'have been revilers, like Lord Orrery . . . and others, like Deane Swift, Esq., have been absurd from lack of judgment.'

Our present business is to see how far Swift's writings explain Swift's conduct in the matter. First, as to the view that Swift abstained on moral grounds from the risk of transmitting his own diseased constitution, it is scarcely conceivable that if such a motive, rare in that age, had influenced him so strongly it should have left no clear trace in his writings.

Secor
thoro
S
tained
Far f
maste
them
deform
which
if the
brute
instin
and w
a cor
Houy
Chris
venier
simpl
' the
and r
sme
these
prime
Mr. C
comb
had in
been
revolt

' Th
Th

till ou
tion v
It
quote
of Sw
intim
convic
The
was in
the S
the ne
licatio
nal id
to eac

Secondly, those writings point to a view of marriage which thoroughly harmonises with Swift's conduct.

Swift, in common with other writers of his school, entertained a profound belief in the individual human reason. Far from admitting that logic is a good tool but a bad master, Swift would have even the purest instincts justify themselves at the bar of reason. A child, say, is vicious and deformed, yet its mother loves it in obedience to an instinct which she shares with the brutes. Instead of allowing that if the brutes possess the maternal instinct, the better for the brutes and not the worse for humanity, Swift reprehends the instinct itself. Similarly in the relation between husband and wife, he sees not a consecration of the animal nature but a concession to the lower impulses. The customs of his Houyhnhnms are the customs of Plato's *Republic* adapted to Christian ethics. Marriages are purely arrangements of convenience in which individual likings play no part; it is simply 'one of the necessary actions of a rational being,' and 'the married pair pass their lives with the same friendship and mutual benevolence that they bear to all others of the same species who come in their way' (xi. 342). Holding these theories, is it to be wondered at that Swift, after the prime of life was past, refused to live in matrimony? But Mr. Craik thinks that Swift, who in his old age successfully combated avarice (as even Johnson most ungraciously allows), had in his earlier days a harder battle to fight. It may have been deliberately that Swift suffered his mind to dwell on the revolting aspect of

'This house with all its hateful needs no cleaner than the beast,
'This Satan-haunted ruin, this little city of sewers,'

till outraged Nature revenged herself and made his imagination what we see it in the last voyage of Gulliver.

It may seem singular that a work so fantastic should be quoted as expressing important convictions; but no student of Swift will hesitate to turn to Gulliver for its author's most intimate convictions on public and private morality; diseased convictions, it is true, but not the less characteristic for that. The original idea of the travels was conceived while Swift was in London, and its execution was a projected scheme of the Scriblerus Club. We have occasional references to it in the next ten years; Vanessa apparently saw it, but the publication was delayed till the end of 1727. We trace the original idea in the first two parts, which are as intimately related to each other as convex and concave. The third book is an

excrecence; in the fourth the satire, which is cumulative, reaches its greatest intensity. Johnson, wishing to detract from the merits of the book, said that once you had got the idea of little men and of big men it was easy enough to write it. Perhaps Johnson felt that there was a deal better satire in his own *London or Vanity of Human Wishes*. Every satirist has to steer a course between the Scylla of ephemeral personalities and the Charybdis of rhetorical declamation; Swift has avoided the difficulty by what Johnson felt to be the petty artifice of making familiar things look strange. Of his skill in making strange things look familiar, that is, of his art as a narrator, Scott is at once the best and most admiring critic. 'It may be said of most similar fictions,' he writes, 'that every incident is a new demand upon the patience and credulity of the reader, and a fresh shock to probability. But if, on the contrary, Swift's first postulates can be granted, if, that is, we are contented to suppose the existence of any such nations as those to which he travels, every other step of the story is so consistent with their probable conduct to himself and to each other, his hopes, fears, and wishes are pointed out with such striking accuracy, the impression which he makes on the nations, and those that he receives from them, are so distinct and lively, that we give way to the force of the author's genius, and are willing to allow him credit for an ideal world in which the improbability of the original conception is palliated by the exquisitely artificial [*sic*] combination of the detail.'¹

Not inferior is the art with which Swift as it were surprises us, first into laughter at our follies, and then into contempt. Gulliver lands on an island where things are reduced from the scale of feet to the scale of inches, and the tiny inhabitants exhibit a ludicrous parody of a human commonwealth. It requires some thought to see that it is ourselves we are laughing at, that the Big-Endians and the Little-Endians have their correspondencies among us; but in Brobdingnag, where a tall man is sixty feet high, the laugh is obviously not on the side of humanity. Humanity may answer that greatness is not measured by inches, and accordingly Gulliver is given an opportunity to present to the king an ideal picture of the British constitution. But he is subjected to an awkward cross-examination, and the monarch sums up as follows: 'I observe among you some lines of an institution which in its original might have been tolerable, but these half erased and the rest wholly blotted and blurred by corruption, . . . and

¹ Editor's Note—*Works*, xi. 9.

finally
'the mo
ever su
liver is
tion, an
gunpow
passage

The
It is no
the foll
he was
extrava
which s
imagin
immort
in stor
than to
treated
is the p

In t
where l
tent wit
men; h
is of all
common
original
The bru
fensible
is the m
Human
built up
some st
the spiri
So surel
swing b
object to
is better
be forgo
under p
duced, i
than Sw
which it
practical
may be

finally concludes that the bulk of Gulliver's natives must be 'the most pernicious race of little, odious vermin that Nature ever suffered to crawl upon the surface of the earth.'¹ Gulliver is left deploring the low state of Brobdingnag's civilization, and proposing to teach the king the manufacture of gunpowder, the uses of which he graphically explains in a passage that does not mend matters for humanity.

The voyage to Laputa is the least artistic part of the work. It is not, like the rest, a satire upon humanity itself, but upon the follies of science; Swift knew humanity to the core, but he was ignorant of science, and his satire here descends to extravagant trivialities. But this book contains a passage which shows in its most terrible character Swift's creative imagination, and the picture of the Struldbrugs, with their immortality of dotage, is an awful foreshadowing of the fate in store for its creator. Nothing can be more interesting than to see how a self-same conception may be *diversely* treated by two great writers. Lord Tennyson's 'Tithonus' is the poetic counterpart to Swift's Struldbrugs.

In the fourth book we reach the last scene of all, the land where horses are men, and men are brutes. Swift is not content with insisting that brutes are in some respects superior to men; he seeks to prove that man, viewed simply as a brute, is of all brutes the basest. Not to speak of the propensities common to all animals, human nature is disfigured by aboriginal instincts which the brutes lack, as, for instance, avarice. The brutality with which Swift has handled this text is indefensible, but the truth conveyed is none the less vital. It is the moral of Mr. Drummond's paper on 'Degeneration.' Human nature, according to Mr. Drummond, has been slowly built up out of animalism by a faculty in man, which with some strange chemistry transmutes the animal instinct into the spiritual impulse, or, as Swift would have said, the rational. So surely as we neglect the spiritual (or rational) element, we swing backwards towards the primitive barbarism. We may object to the manner in which Swift chose to say this, but it is better that such things should be said than that they should be forgotten, and so noble a nature as Count Tolstoi's has, under pressure of the same warping tendency of mind, produced, in the *Kreutzer Sonata*, a book even less defensible than Swift's. Swift has been accused of misanthropy, to which it may be replied that a man who shows as much practical benevolence as did Swift throughout his whole life, may be excused from entertaining a rapturous admiration for

¹ *Works*, xi. 170.

humanity in the abstract. He has been accused of cynicism, a charge to which his admiration for Rochefoucauld lent some colour; but the *sæva indignatio* of Swift is incompatible with the easy philosophy of cynicism. He might reiterate as he pleased Prior's motto, *Vive la bagatelle*, but all the while 'the corruption of men in power was eating into his flesh and exhausting his spirits.'¹ Swift, it must always be remembered, was his own *advocatus diaboli*, practising a kind of 'hypocrisy reversed' as Bolingbroke said, and we have always to be amending, from the history of his actions, his own account of his character. Looking at his actions, at the record of his life, we repeat that Swift was no more a cynic than Dante, 'who loved well because he hated.' Of the cynicism that has passed from the mind into the heart, that disbelieves in the finer shade of feeling because it is dead to them itself, the creed of the money-grubbing stockbrokers who are blessed because they will never be disappointed, there is not a trace in Swift's frank and generous nature.

Like all men, Swift had his hours of cynicism. Shakespeare had when he wrote *Troilus and Cressida*; but the saner, finer genius passed out of it into the clear calm of his latter plays. Round Swift the atmosphere grew murkier as he aged, and his mind suffered a sort of demoniac possession. His last verses, the *Legion Club*, are almost insane in their fury; the intensity of hatred conceals the love of liberty which inspired that hate. Swift had lived the best years of his life in England. 'There,' he writes to Gay, 'there I made my friendships, and there I left my desires' (xvi. 398). Returning to Ireland, the contrast between the two countries forced itself upon him—between the freedom of England and Irish slavery. It has been urged that this contrast was late in striking him, that in the days of his power nothing was heard of Irish grievances. There is truth in the charge, though perhaps, humanly speaking, the same zeal for reform is not to be looked for in the holders of office as distinguishes an opposition. Yet as early as 1708 in the *Letters on the Sacramental Test* there is a sharply satiric passage when Swift puts in the mouth of Ireland Cowley's lines to his mistress:—

'Forbid it, heaven, my life should be
Weighed with thy least conveniency' (viii. 358).

Up to 1710 Swift was busy with other interests than politics. During his connexion with Harley's ministry he was too much preoccupied with the burning questions of the day to

¹ Delaney's *Observations*, p. 148.

think of
statesman
his insight
in which
standing
the subject
before S
tion of I
woollen c
gratitude
regarding
understr
in 1720,
the posit
which de
jurisdiction
power, an
pretensio
arena in
He accep
or visitat
since she
one at h
printer of
of whom
place) dec
the Prete
exertions
stopped
episode o
object, op
create a
(disgrace
Swift kne
the tong
people fr
fight for
are mere
incapable
in history
supposed

¹ Wood
Ireland wh
Aristotle's
may be ext

Jan.

cynicism,
ent some
tible with
ate as he
while 'the
n and ex-
membered,
hypocrisy
ys to be
ccount of
ord of his
an Dante,
n that has
ves in the
itself, the
re blessed
ot a trace

. Shake-
; but the
alm of his
murkier as
possession.
e in their
erty which
of his life
made my
Returning
orced itself
ish slavery.
iking him,
d of Irish
h perhaps
not to be
an opposi-
acramental
puts in the

558).

erests than
stry he was
f the day to

think of Ireland; and lastly, it was the practical training in statesmanship acquired from that connexion that quickened his insight into the abnormal and diseased state of the nation in which he was called to live. The mischief was of old standing. Absenteeism, the first and greatest curse, had been the subject of prohibitive laws, lapsed, however, into disuse before Swift's days. The edict which forbade the exportation of Irish cattle dated from Charles II.; the embargo on woollen exports was one of the things for which Ireland owed gratitude to the memory of 'Glorious.' The practice of regarding Irish offices as the natural prerogative of English understrappers was hallowed by venerable antiquity. But in 1720, under Walpole's rule, a new blow had been struck at the position of Ireland by an Act of the English Parliament which denied the right of the Irish House of Peers to a final jurisdiction, an Act for which there was no justification but power, and no reason but the deliberate desire to repress the pretensions of Ireland to independence. Swift comes into the arena in 1721, not as a repealer, but as a reformer of conduct. He accepts the existing laws as though they were some plague or visitation from heaven; his proposal is merely that Ireland, since she is forbidden to seek a market abroad, should make one at home by a general use of Irish manufactures. The printer of this tract was prosecuted, and the Judge (Whitshed, of whom Swift afterwards wrote that he had *gone to his own place*) declared from the bench that it was a plot to bring in the Pretender. The jury, however, in spite of his laudable exertions, refused to bring in a verdict, and proceedings were stopped by a *noli prosequi*. In 1724 came the famous episode of Wood's halfpence and the *Drapier Letters*. Swift's object, openly enough avowed in the fourth *Drapier*, is to create a spirit of national independence. Wood's contract (disgraceful job though it was) gave merely the occasion. Swift knew that phrase-making, though he should speak with the tongues of men and of angels, would never rouse a people from a state of slavery. It is only free men who will fight for freedom. The threatened results of the new coinage are merely a piece of political mythology, good for minds incapable of grasping the truth. There are many such myths in history, even in contemporary history.¹ It is not to be supposed that Swift expected to see Squire Conolly's rents

¹ Wood's halfpence were to the reaction against English rule in Ireland what the greased cartridges were to the Indian Mutiny. Aristotle's dictum that wars have great causes but petty occasions, may be extended to revolutions.

coming to Dublin behind fifty couple of horses; it may be, however, that his ideas on the currency were unsound. That at least he went thoroughly into the question is clear from his letter on the project of one M'Culla to coin halfpence in Ireland as a speculation. The important thing was that the *Drapier* had beaten the Government, and that public opinion in Ireland was now an appreciable factor. Swift left nothing undone to cultivate it. In a copious series of pamphlets he pointed out clearly the specific evils from which Ireland suffered, and suggested immediate remedies for those which were remediable from within, sowing meanwhile words that might breed an organized resistance to the greater and more shameful drawbacks to Irish prosperity. It is a pity that Mr. Craik has not drawn together to a head the information which is scattered up and down through his book on the subject of Swift's Irish policy. It is a pity that he has not added to that information. Mr. Craik does not hint how far we may trust Swift's authority; he neither verifies nor refutes his numerous and detailed statements as to the condition of Irish trade and Irish agriculture. In both of these we may gather that Swift blamed first the character of the natives, and secondly the conditions which were largely responsible for that character. The tenants could not be trusted to treat land fairly, so in most leases there was a clause forbidding or limiting tillage, so that Ireland came to be dependent on England for her corn supply. Trade was hampered by arbitrary restrictions and demoralized by the smuggling which they produced. The tradesmen were dishonest and unbusinesslike. A plague at Marseilles had sent Spanish custom to Ireland for linen; the merchants by their dishonest practices lost the opening thus given. 'If you force them to trade like pedlars,' Swift comments, 'can you wonder if they cheat like pedlars?' Incessantly he repeats two maxims: 'Buy home-made goods,' and 'Be honest in your dealings.' He recommends that the Houses of Parliament should set an example in the matter of wearing Irish stuffs; he advises public rewards for home industries; and he exerts the utmost powers of his sarcasm on the servile imitation of English manners that leads even to a preference for English goods. But there is no project that escapes his criticism; he is ready with schemes for mending the highways, for the better regulation of bog lands, for planting forests—entering into all with keen practical wisdom.

The whole subject requires a lengthier treatment than could here be given to it; it must suffice to note the literary

charac
hand
Treaty
of des
to cor
seekin
apprel
gladia
Burke
Maxim
tended
that y
operat
countr
in Ire
but to
comm

For
swervi
bestow
value,
Ireland
viator
vindica

Th
Swift's
easy-te
inferior
learned
pursuit
or writ
lacking
wife.
these a
lived s
happily
appreh
pangs
howeve
where
the los
the ach
From
bearabl

characteristics of these later tracts. Joined to the skill in handling facts that had made luminous even the Barrier Treaty, there is now a piercing all-pervading irony—the irony of despair. The tone is not that of a clever debater striving to convince; it is the bitter and defiant utterance of a man seeking to burn hateful truths into sluggish or unwilling apprehensions. But they are not the weapons of a desperate gladiator; they are the expressions of a statesman's mind. Burke's admiration should have secured more readers for the *Maxims controlled in Ireland*, where Swift analyses the pretended signs of prosperity in Ireland, and conclusively shows that you cannot argue as if the laws of political economy operated under such conditions as were then present in that country. The rate of interest, to take one instance, was low in Ireland, but this was due not to the plenty of money, but to the absence of demand for capital where there was no commercial enterprise.

For his services to Ireland Swift was repaid by the unswerving devotion which it is the virtue of her people to bestow on their leaders, a reward he valued, or seemed to value, lightly. Yet it was in the name of his services to Ireland that he appealed to the verdict of posterity: 'Abi viator et imitare si poteris strenuum pro virili libertatis vindicatorem.'¹

There is not space left to dwell on the gloomy history of Swift's later years. He surrounded himself deliberately with easy-tempered friends who were willing to be treated as his inferiors. Of these the chief was Dr. Sheridan, a witty and learned man, who was Swift's chief rival and coadjutor in the pursuit of *la bagatelle*; perpetually ready to rhyme, to pun, or write nonsense in English or Latin. He was, however, lacking in common prudence, and possessed of a slatternly wife. Swift, with characteristic brutality, spared neither of these attributes, and quarrels were frequent; yet while Stella lived she kept the peace to some extent. Her life was unhappily a short one. For two years Swift lived in agonized apprehension of her end; he fled to England to escape the pangs of attending her death-bed. He was at her bedside, however, in 1728, when she died, and we have the *Journal* where he attempts to set down and order his thoughts while the loss was fresh, words that reproduce with terrible fidelity the aching dulness of bereavement.

From this onward his temper grew more and more unbearable. Old age lent no mellowing touch to his life.

¹ Epitaph in St. Patrick's Cathedral.

'There is no such thing,' he once said, 'as a fine old gentleman. If a man had a body or a mind worth a rap, they would have worn him out long before he was old.'¹ Swift's fierce soul never rested till it was frost-bound in the torpor of idiocy. His vertigo grew upon him, bringing deafness as well as pain and giddiness, and driving his mind in upon itself. The better class of his friends—even Mrs. Whiteway, who watched with touching fidelity by his death-bed—found it impossible to keep up their intercourse with him, and were replaced by a pack of flatterers, whom Swift with his unsparing analysis knew for what they were, and detested himself for the pleasure he took in their society. The bitterness of Stella's loss was enhanced by disappointment. In 1727 he had been well received by the Princess Caroline; when George II. succeeded he was visited by disquieting hopes of preferment and the change of scene which he had fresh reason ardently to desire. The hope passed away, leaving new bitterness, and it was then he wrote to Bolingbroke that he would indeed cease to think of this world 'if I could get into a better before I am called to the best, and not die here like a poisoned rat in a hole.'² From 1730 onwards he lived much by himself. The following picture of his life is given in a letter to the Rev. Mr. Winder (his successor at Kilroot), and bears date 19 Feb. 1731-2:—

'I am as mere a monk as any in Spain, and there is not a clergyman on top of a mountain who so little converses with mankind, or is so little regarded by them on any other account, except showing malice. All this I bear as well as I can, and eat my morsel alone like a king; and [am] constantly at home when I am not riding or walking, which I do often, and always alone. I give you this picture of myself out of old friendship, whence you may judge what share of mirth or spirits are now left me. Yet I cannot read at night, and am therefore forced to scribble, whereof nine things in ten are burned next morning.'³

Avarice had something to answer for in this isolation, but it was an avarice that never curtailed a gift to charity; on the contrary, what Swift saved on a dinner to a friend or a coach-hire, it was his habit to give to some deserving pauper.

Biographers have heaped up instances of Swift's generosity, and rightly; for his hard words have lived after him, and the kind deeds been forgotten. For years he paid fifty pounds annually to Mrs. Dingley, making her believe that it was the profit of an investment of her money. Yet if any one goes into the library of Trinity College, what notion will

¹ Delaney. ² *Works*, xvi. 249. ³ *Ibid.* xvii. 444.

he form
publicl

'MA
of your
taking a
your Pr
case, an
run into
Gentlem
you have
leave he
refuse, s
her kno
sponden
case, tha
(if she s
given he
eyes op
people, s
expect to
of half a
and wha
and let
of it to
keep to
whoever
give you
daughter
charity t
This is a
So I con

Deanery
To l

Not
makes o
that it n
of advic
is far m
Swift's v
on it, h
year, unt

¹ This
by Lieut
printed (w
Board of
VOL. X

he form of the writer of such a letter as this, which is there publicly exposed :—

'MADAM,—I have been considering the account you gave me of your eldest daughter's conveying herself out of your house, and taking all her cloaths with her, determining to get herself out of your Protection. I have been assured that there is a man in the case, and that she hath been enticed by some servant of yours to run into the arms of some beggarly rascal who would pass for a Gentleman of fortune. Altho' such an action in a daughter whom you have used so well can deserve no pardon, yet I would have you leave her without excuse. Send to her to come home. If she refuse, send a second and a third time, and if she still refuseth, Let her know in plain terms that you will never have the least correspondence with her, and when she is ruined, as will certainly be the case, that you will never see her, nor give or leave her or her children (if she shall have any) a morsel of bread.—Let her know you have given her fair warning, and if she will run into destruction with her eyes open, against common sense and the opinion of all rational people, she hath none to blame but herself; And that she must not expect to move your compassion some years hence with the cries of half a dozen children at your door for want of bread. Let this and whatever else you think proper be writ to her in your own hand, and let your letter be given her before witnesses, and keep a copy of it to produce when there is occasion; And shew the copy you keep to any acquaintance who may be willing to see it. And let whoever pleaseth see this Letter of mine as the best advice I can give you. For you are to suppose that you never had such a daughter, and that her children will have no more title to your charity than the bratts and bastards of any other common beggar. This is all I think necessary to say upon so disagreeable a Subject—So I conclude, Madam,

Your most obedient servt.

JONATH. SWIFT.

Deanery House, Jul. 12th, 1733.

To Mrs. Swanton, St. Peter's Street.¹

Nothing can wholly efface the impression such a letter makes on the mind; yet it cannot be too strongly urged that it misrepresents the writer. To begin with, it is a piece of advice not volunteered, but solicited; secondly, and this is far more important, it related to a subject on which Swift's views bordered on insanity. The best commentary on it, however, is a letter written in March of the next year, unfortunately much too long to quote, where Swift, with

¹ This letter, given in 1831 to the Library of Trinity College, Dublin, by Lieutenant-Colonel Dwyer, of Dawson Court, Blackrock, is here printed (we believe for the first time) by the kind permission of the Board of Trinity College.

admirable tact and kindliness, pleads for a lad of one-and-twenty who had been turned adrift by his parents for early misconduct, and wrote to Swift, though a perfect stranger to him, asking his mediation.¹ The circumstances of the two cases point strikingly to Swift's general censorship of morals, which was a principal part of his activity up till the collapse in 1740, when the brain disease mastered him completely, and furious insanity set in, succeeded by

'The staring eye, glazed o'er with sapless days,
The long mechanic paces to and fro,
The set gray life and apathetic end.'

It is a pleasure to turn from this record of decay and dissolution to glance briefly at the wonderful correspondence which fills the years of Swift's Irish residence. Swift's own letters are the best of the collection; he is cleverer than Bolingbroke, and as sympathetic as Arbuthnot. It is odd that no one has edited a selection of them, which might be of unsurpassed interest. Swift was a staunch friend; with each gap in the circle a fibre seems to be torn out of his heart. Of the men of his own age his friendship seems to have been strongest for Harley and Arbuthnot; to Arbuthnot alone of his English acquaintance does he show his feeling at the loss of Stella. With these two the tie was one of likeness; there is no noisy protestation of affection between them, but there is no more touching passage in the whole correspondence than that where Arbuthnot in 1714 replies to Swift's 'tender melancholy word that you will endeavour to forget me.'² The quiet stoicism with which Arbuthnot foretold his own end was Swift's ideal; indeed Swift himself was 'more an ancient Roman than a Dean.'

Very different is the friendship Swift felt for Pope, the noble love that men passing their prime feel sometimes for youths who might have been their sons. He is in love with Pope's genius, which in its intellectual perfection realized to the full Swift's conception of genius. Pope's moral defects he overlooks with a lover's partiality, heightening, loverlike, his real qualities, and he has a lover's compassionate tenderness for the bodily infirmities of that puny frame. In such affections the elder man gives most. Few men could have maintained such a literary partnership with Pope as did Swift; perhaps no one else, for no one else was ever so careless of the profits of literature and so free from literary jealousy and touchiness. They have come down to us, as

¹ *Works*, xviii. 285.

² *Works*, xvi. 197.

they w
summi
sapless
reader
myster
Swift a
yards
his epi
thing c
comm
that th
regard

ART

Englan
in
CO

THE w
amount
has of
not onl
prose a
sacked
names
is to sh
old time
physical
century
picture
ray of
can only

The wh
rotten t
It is
with tha
the beg
recapitu
thus :

they wished it, hand in hand, dominating their age, curiously summing up in themselves the tendencies of a somewhat sapless and unsympathetic literature. Probably Pope has ten readers now for one student of his friend; yet there is a mystery of sorrow and of greatness associated with the name of Swift and wholly peculiar to it. He is nearer to us; among the yards of empty antithesis that cover the walls of St. Patrick's, his epitaph speaks to us in an unmistakable accent; something of the spell of that magical personality thrills in it and commands our attention, carrying to our souls the conviction that the words are neither lightly spoken nor lightly to be regarded. In his sincerity lies the secret of Swift's greatness.

ART. IX.—ENGLAND IN THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY.

England and the English in the Eighteenth Century. Chapters in the Social History of the Times. By WILLIAM CONNOR SYDNEY. (London, 1891.)

THE writer of these volumes has collected a considerable amount of information about a period which, for various causes, has of late years attracted a large share of attention. He has not only consulted the standard authors, grave and gay, in prose and in poetry, in history and in fiction, but he has ransacked the newspapers and magazines of the period, the very names of some of which are well-nigh forgotten. His object is to show that 'the good old times' were in reality very bad old times; that in every department of life, social and political, physical and mental, secular and religious, the eighteenth century was immeasurably inferior to the nineteenth. The picture is drawn in the gloomiest colours, unrelieved by any ray of light. As he looks back upon that bygone time he can only cry with Milton's Samson:

'Dark, dark, dark, irrecoverably dark.'

The whole century from beginning to end is, in his view, rotten to the core.

It is curious to contrast Mr. Connor Sydney's estimate with that of another writer who described the same period at the beginning of the present century (1803). Mr. Miller recapitulates his *Brief Retrospect of the Eighteenth Century* thus:

'There have been periods in which particular studies were more cultivated ; but it may be asserted with confidence that in no period of the same extent since the Creation has a mass of improvement so large, diversified, and rich been presented to view. In no period have the various branches of science, art, and letters received, at the same time, such liberal accessions of light and refinement, and been made so remarkably to illustrate and enlarge each other. Never did the inquirer stand at the confluence of so many streams of knowledge as at the close of the eighteenth century. . . . The last century may with peculiar propriety be styled the *Age of Taste and Refinement* ; and also the Age of Infidel Philosophy, and the Age of Christian Science. It is worthy of remark that, among the professions denominated *learned*, the *clerical* profession may be considered as having furnished as many, if not more, authors of distinction than any other. And if we join to the clergy those lay-authors who have been no less eminent as Christians than as scholars, the predominance of learning and talents on the side of Religion will appear too great to admit of any comparison. Those, therefore, who have witnessed the close of the century under review, have indeed reason to congratulate themselves as an highly-favoured generation. . . . They have seen a larger portion of human society enlightened, polished, and comfortable than ever before greeted the eye of benevolence,' &c.

How completely Mr. Connor Sydney differs in his estimate will appear in the sequel. And he certainly has much to say for his view of the case. In spite of its panegyrists, the eighteenth century surely *was*, on the whole, a coarse and worldly age ; the improvements which have taken place in every sphere are very remarkable ; and we are quite inclined to agree with what Mr. Sydney implies, viz. that the turn of the tide synchronized approximately with the dawn of the new century. There is also another fact worthy of notice. When the National Church was fast asleep, the state of the national life in all its phases was bad ; when the Church woke up, matters began to improve, and have gone on improving from that day to this. It will be seen that we have dated this awakening of the Church earlier than is usually done ; and we have done this advisedly, for we believe that during the whole of the nineteenth century the Church has been doing honest work in one shape or another ; and the results are to be seen in the very different state of things at the commencement and towards the close of that period. Just as if you want to know whether a child or a tree is growing, you must not look at it and expect to see visible signs of its growth, but must compare its stature now with what it was some years ago, so it is with a church or a nation. Judged by immediate results, earnest workers may often seem to be beating the air ; the effects of their work can only be estimated by comparing

period
wide,
percep
1881 ;
be sta
the ot
Miller
with t

By
the w
indust
are bo
by co
attitud
anxie
that t
centur
per co
of the
the ti
be use
author

W
comin
grants
and th
alike
might
the de

And
cheap
by a
or eve
Dick
the jo
is an
as a g
a mo

periods separated from one another by a wide, but not too wide, interval. The England of 1891 may not present any perceptible improvement when compared with the England of 1881; but compare it with the England of 1800, and you will be startled by the marvellous change for good. Compare, on the other hand, 1800 with 1714, and we are not sure (*pace* Mr. Miller) whether the advantage would not in many respects lie with the earlier period.

By enabling us to make comparison between two periods the writer of these volumes has done good work through his industrious investigations, and we thank him for it. But we are bound to add that his book greatly needs to be balanced by counter-statements. For, all through, he assumes the attitude, not of a judge, but of an advocate. In his nervous anxiety to point the moral that people should be thankful that their lot is cast in the nineteenth and not in the eighteenth century, he has certainly ignored all that may fairly be urged *per contra*; and as in the interests of the truth, and especially of the truth about our own Church, it is well to do justice to the times of our grandfathers and great-grandfathers, it may be useful to bring out some redeeming features to which our author seems to have resolutely shut his eyes.

We may pass lightly over the material and social shortcomings on which Mr. Sydney lays much stress. It may be granted that in the days before Macadam the high roads and the by roads, the town streets and the village lanes were alike intolerable. Mr. Sydney is fond of quoting Cowper; he might have fortified his remarks on this point by referring to the delightful *jeu d'esprit*:

I sing of a journey to Clifton
We would have perform'd if we could,
Without cart or barrow to lift on
Poor Mary and me through the mud!
Sle sla slud,
Stuck in the mud,
Oh, it is pretty to wade through a flood.

And so on. It may be granted that it is more comfortable, cheap, and expeditious to travel, say, from London to York by a Great Northern express than by the old stage waggon or even 'the flying coach;' and that the chance of meeting Dick Turpin on the way would not enhance the pleasures of the journey. It may be granted that the modern policeman is an improvement upon the ancient dilapidated watchman as a guardian of the public safety; that a modern house is a more commodious, if less picturesque, residence than an

eighteenth century one; that modern pastimes are less brutal than the bull-baiting, bear-baiting, and cock-fighting which found favour with our ancestors; that our modern criminal code is less cruel and more efficacious than that which it has happily superseded; though, by the way, we doubt whether even the later part of the nineteenth century would come out scatheless from the ordeal which Mr. Sydney has applied to the eighteenth, and whether as melancholy an account of human crime and misery might not be gathered from a file of the *Times* as he has drawn from the pages of the *Public Advertiser* and other newspapers of the period. However, let that pass; but there are some points on which we must venture to enter a gentle protest.

I. *Education*.—‘The low state of mental culture with which all classes of English society were imbued in the last century’ (ii. 86) is the theme of one of Mr. Sydney’s diatribes. He represents upper-class, middle-class, and elementary education as being alike in a most deplorable state, and adduces abundance of evidence in support of his position. But not one word has he to say about the efforts which were made in behalf of education, and not one word of evidence does he produce, though it was ready at his hand, to show that these efforts were not altogether unsuccessful. For instance, it is surely not a complete account of ‘Education’—that is the comprehensive title of his chapter—which utterly ignores the charity schools, many of which were founded, and all of which flourished, more or less, during the eighteenth century. He seems to have consulted diligently and to put an implicit—far too implicit—faith in the testimony of periodicals. Did he not remember what Steele in 1712 and Addison in 1713 wrote about the wide-spread success of the charity schools?

‘The Charity Schools,’ wrote the former,¹ ‘which have been erected of late years are the greatest instances of public spirit which the age has produced.’

‘I have always,’ wrote the latter,² ‘looked on this institution of Charity Schools—which of late years has so universally prevailed through the whole nation—as the glory of the age we live in, and the most proper means that can be made use of to recover it out of its present degeneracy and depravation of manners. It seems to promise us an honest and virtuous posterity. There will be few in the next generation who will not at least be able to write and read, and have not had an early tincture of religion.’

The efforts of the S.P.C.K., too, in this direction might surely

¹ *Spectator*, No. 294.

² *Guardian*, No. 105.

have cl
said, how
century.
in May
the kno
than th
observe
not who
of many
neglecte
same co
that the
stations.
we have

‘was bre
contribut
visited us
that our
instructe

One of
filled wi
told her
of serva
since ed
Broom g
mistress
fortune,
parish, v
teaching
less an a
and mos
Memoirs
pose, spe
impulse,

Nor
Shenston
sions), w
while fo
school d
the instr
but in th
utterly in
regular s
they des

have claimed at least a passing word of recognition. It may be said, however, that all this applies only to the earlier part of the century. Let us turn then to *The Idler*, No. 7, which appeared in May 1758: 'All foreigners remark,' says the writer, 'that the knowledge of the common people of *England* is greater than that of any other vulgar . . .' and then he goes on to observe that 'this universal diffusion of instruction is, perhaps, not wholly without its inconveniences.' In fact, in the opinion of many, the education of the lower classes, instead of being neglected, was being carried too far. We find exactly the same complaints in the eighteenth century as we hear to-day, that the education of the poor unfitted them for their menial stations. In two later numbers of *The Idler*, Nos. 26 and 29, we have an amusing history of 'Betty Broom,' who tells us she

'was bred in the country at a charity school, maintained by the contributions of wealthy neighbours. The ladies, or patronesses, visited us from time to time, examined how we were taught, and saw that our clothes were clean. We lived happily enough, and were instructed to be thankful to those at whose cost we were educated.'

One of the ladies, having spent a winter in London, came back filled with an opinion that education was doing harm. 'She told her friends that *London* was in confusion by the insolence of servants; that scarcely a wench was to be got for *all work*, since education had made such numbers of fine ladies.' Betty Broom gives an account of her various places, till at last a mistress dies who leaves her five hundred pounds; 'with this fortune,' she concludes, 'I am going to settle in my native parish, where I resolved to spend some hours every day in teaching poor girls to read and write.' Betty Broom was no less an authority than the great Dr. Johnson, who wrote these and most of the papers in *The Idler*. Malcolm, again, whose *Memoirs* Mr. Sydney frequently quotes when it suits his purpose, speaks of these charity schools as established 'by divine impulse,' not only in London, but in all parts of the country.

Nor can we regard the dame school, which, according to Shenstone (who is also quoted by Mr. Sydney on other occasions), was to be found in every village, as completely useless; while for the last twenty years of the century the Sunday school devoted four or five or even six hours every week to the instruction of children, not only in religious knowledge, but in the three R's. We fully admit that these measures were utterly inadequate, and that there was a grievous want of a regular system of education throughout the country, but surely they deserved *some* notice in a chapter professing to treat of

'Education.' Before leaving this branch of the subject it may be added that it was no unusual thing for a clergyman, when he found a promising boy in his village, to educate him himself, sometimes even up to the time of his going to the university. It was in this way that Thomas Hearne, the Oxford antiquary, received his education, and many other instances might be found.

Ascending a step higher in the educational scale, we are inclined to think that the grammar schools, established in almost every town in the land, were by no means idle and useless. Among their masters were men of considerable talents and unimpeachable characters, and it is inconceivable that such men should treat their offices as sinecures. And they had a better supply of pupils than they have now. For those bad roads and bad conveyances, which are so grievous to Mr. Sydney, led many parents of the class which would now be ambitious of a public school education for their sons, to be content with the local grammar school; and, moreover, it was the commonest thing in the world for the curate of the parish to eke out his scanty income by teaching the sons of the better class of his parishioners. Finally we should not ignore (as Mr. Sydney has done) the useful work done among the middle and lower-middle classes by the dissenting academies, which were in a highly flourishing condition, especially in the earlier part of the century, and at one of which two of the most eminent prelates of the century, Dr. Butler and Dr. Secker, received their education at the same time.

We next come to the Public Schools, and we fully admit that all through the eighteenth century they sorely needed the reform so nobly commenced by Dr. Arnold in the first half of the nineteenth; but let us be just to them even in their unreformed state. And it is *not* just to take, as Mr. Sydney does, the evidence of such a witness as William Cowper on this point. His tender and morbidly sensitive nature quite unfitted him for the rough ordeal of a public school at its best, and his diatribes against the system must be read in the light of his own experience. We might as well condemn Rugby, after its purgation by Dr. Arnold, because the saintly Charles Marriott found it too rough for him, as condemn Westminster because the far more delicate nature of Cowper did not thrive there. John Wesley certainly profited by his training at Charterhouse, and so did Samuel and Charles Wesley at Westminster. And there were men whose education would have done honour to any school in any age, such

as S
Low
mor

the
quit
posi
proc
burt
and
to a
Ben
Mr.
less
agai
with
Syd

join
syst
as a
life,
tion
fort
to c
best
we
mus
Wh
Con
for
Sca
Eng
sele
hist
Dea
mar
poe
The
bee
Swi

not
eve
be

as Samuel Horsley who was trained at Westminster, Robert Lowth at Winchester, Samuel Parr at Harrow, and many more.

Perhaps the weakest point in the educational scheme was the highest. Oxford and Cambridge, especially Oxford, were quite unworthy in the eighteenth century of the unique position which they held; and though it would be easy to produce instances of some great men, such as Lowth, Warburton, Parr, and even to a certain extent Samuel Johnson and John Wesley, who speak well of the universities, and also to adduce instances of good work done, notably by Dr. Bentley at Trinity College, Cambridge—still there is no item in Mr. Sydney's accusations against the eighteenth century which less requires to be qualified than the case which he makes out against the two great English Universities. Closely connected with the educational subject is another on which Mr. Connor Sydney has nothing but evil to report. It is what he calls

II. *The Literary World*.—Here again we must certainly join issue with him, not, indeed, as to the badness of the system against which he inveighs, but as to the results which as a matter of fact came from it. The miseries of literary life, the evils of private patronage, of publishing by subscription, of being compelled to make fulsome dedications, and so forth, are patent enough. But, in spite of all this, it is curious to observe in how many departments of literature the very best specimens are the work of the eighteenth century. If we ask, Who was the prince of letter writers? the answer must surely be, either William Cowper or Horace Walpole. What is the best comedy? Is not Goldsmith's *She Stoops to Conquer* bad to beat? And among those which run it hard for the first place should we not place Sheridan's *School for Scandal* and *The Rivals*? If asked to name the greatest English theological work, should we not hesitate before selecting any in preference to Butler's *Analogy*? The greatest history in English? How many are superior to Gibbon's *Decline and Fall*? The most interesting biography? How many rank before Boswell's *Johnson*? The sweetest pastoral poem? How many surpass Goldsmith's *Deserted Village*? The best essays? Have those of Addison and Steele ever been excelled? The best satires? How many are equal to Swift's *Gulliver's Travels* and *Tale of a Tub*?

But for proofs of mental culture we should perhaps turn, not to the works of men of acknowledged genius—though even men of genius must be educated, or else they too will be born to blush unseen—but to those which are evidently

the product of average minds. Now the eighteenth century was essentially an age of controversies, and of the ephemeral literature which controversies evoke. From the Bangorian controversy in the early part of the century, to the 'Church and King' or French Revolution controversy at its close, disputes where all sorts of literary combatants rushed into the fray, were perpetually going on; and a somewhat minute and extensive investigation of this fugitive literature has led us to the conclusion that the proportion of men who could write decent English (a by no means universal accomplishment) was very large. Indeed, Mr. Sydney's own book supplies a refutation of his too sweeping statement about the lack of mental culture. The passages which he quotes from eighteenth-century writers, and the still more numerous references which he gives, will, if the student takes the trouble to hunt them out, show him what a large number of people there were who, to speak frankly, could write far better English than Mr. Sydney himself can. But we are growing personal, and had better pass on to another head.

III. *The Political World* is painted by Mr. Sydney in the darkest colours. He dwells on the bribery and corruption, the intimidation, the riots which took place at election time, the jobbery, the close boroughs, and so forth and so forth. We have no desire to dispute his facts or his inference, and on this point would only remark in passing that Sir Robert Walpole has quite enough of real sins to answer for without having imputed to him one of which he was not guilty. Mr. Sydney quotes yet again the oft-quoted saying attributed to Walpole—'All men have their price.' But we believe it is a saying which Sir Robert never uttered. Pointing to a number of men, he said, 'All *these* men have their price,' which is a very different matter. However, let it be admitted that the whole Parliamentary system was as unsatisfactory as Mr. Sydney represents it during the eighteenth century; the fact still remains that never in the whole course of British history did there arise greater statesmen, more brilliant orators, more interesting men in the political world than under this corrupt system. We think of Edmund Burke, of the two Pitts, father and son, of William Wilberforce, and of many others, and can hardly help feeling that there must have been some good in a time which produced such men as these. But we pass on to a point which will probably be the most interesting of all to readers of the *Church Quarterly Review*, most of whom would fall under the designation of

IV. *The Religious World*.—Worse than the politics, worse

than
the r
the e
who
Chur
in no
But h
not c
be sa
cution
itself
Over
the G
in the
that i
the i
of inc
whole
the c
avera
too co
writen
though
been
gent
Deists
tianity
Christ
but n
admit
writen
spirit
Priest
lition
He q
clergy
with v
to Bis
him f
of the
disting
same
writin
Lord
at the

than the education, worse than the literature, worse even than the roads, was, in Mr. Sydney's view, the state of religion in the eighteenth century; and he would be indeed a bold man who should undertake to defend or palliate the abuses in the Church and other religious communities—for the Church was in no worse plight than her neighbours—during that period. But here again Mr. Sydney plays the part of the advocate, not of the judge; he closes his ears to everything that can be said in favour of the criminal, as the counsel for the prosecution is wont to do; and that even when it almost forces itself upon his notice. Thus he quotes with approval Mr. Overton's remark that 'the religious apathy which set in with the Georgian era is one of the most remarkable phenomena in the history of religion'; but he quite forgets to mention that in the very next sentence the same writer protests against the idea that the earlier years of the century were a period of inertness; he includes in one sweeping condemnation the whole of the period, just as if nothing had been adduced on the other side. He quotes Mr. Abbey's description of the average eighteenth century sermon as 'too stiff and formal, too cold and artificial'; but entirely ignores all that the same writer has to say about the good points of that composition, though on his own showing this ought not surely to have been ignored, for he owns that Mr. Abbey 'has made a diligent study' of the subject. He dwells upon the efforts of the Deists to draw down contempt upon the doctrines of Christianity, and more than insinuates that the shortcomings of Christians were responsible for the spread of Deism (ii. 328); but not one word has he to say about the undoubted fact, admitted on all hands, that the able efforts of the Christian writers completely drove Deism out of the field. In the same spirit he has something to say about the Unitarianism of Dr. Priestley, but not one single word about the complete demolition of Dr. Priestley by Bishop (then Archdeacon) Horsley. He quotes with approval Bishop Burnet's strictures upon the clergy, but says nothing about the indignant chorus of denial with which those strictures were immediately met. He refers to Bishop Watson's assertion that Lord Shelburne nominated him for a bishopric, expecting him to use his pen in favour of the ministry; but he does not add that Bishop Watson distinctly refused to do so. He has much to say about the same prelate's non-residence, but not a word about his telling writings in defence of religion. He triumphantly confirms Lord Macaulay's representation of the low state of the clergy at the close of the seventeenth century, and adds that it

would apply to the greater part of the eighteenth; but his mode of arguing is a glaring instance of the *ignoratio elenchi* fallacy; he simply tells us that he has consulted Macaulay's authorities and finds that they are quoted correctly (ii. 330), and he calmly assumes that the impugners of the historian (by whom he means, we presume, especially Mr. Churchill Babington, Mr. Gladstone, and Mr. Overton) have neglected to consult these authorities. But if he would only take the trouble to observe what these gentlemen have written, he would find that they do not accuse Lord Macaulay of misquoting his authorities, but that they demur to the authorities themselves, contending that old plays and satires, romances and ephemeral pamphlets, are quite insufficient to ground so serious an assertion upon. He has plenty to say about the lax and worldly lives of the clergy, but hardly a word about the saintly lives of such men as George Berkeley, William Law, and the good men who were the fathers of the Evangelical school. His remark about one of these last is utterly misleading. He describes James Hervey, author of the *Meditations among the Tombs*, as 'a divine who certainly allured his flock to brighter worlds, if he did not lead the way' (ii. 344). Now, if this means anything, it means that Hervey's writings were better than his life. But the very reverse was the case. Hervey's life was that of a blameless, diligent parish priest; while as to his writings, it seems to us that Mr. Sydney has lost an opportunity of giving point to his depreciation of the eighteenth century by showing the bad taste of the many among whom those writings were popular.

This is not the way to write history. But, apart from his one-sided view of things, Mr. Sydney has really not saturated himself sufficiently in his subject to be a trustworthy historian; had he done so, he would never have fallen into numberless inaccuracies which, slight as some of them may be, are quite sufficient to distinguish him from a real historian of the period like Mr. Lecky. He would never, for instance, have told us that 'the National Church lost its hold upon the conduct and habits of all classes of society' (ii. 323). Anyone who had made a real study of the eighteenth century would know that one of the grudges which we owe to the Church of that day is that, retaining as it did in a most remarkable degree its hold upon the national life, it did not turn its vast influence to better account. He would never have undertaken to write one chapter on the 'Literary World' and another on the 'Religious World' without having read John Byrom, who, in his odd way, was a prominent member of both worlds. He

refers
tende
ance
He w
gious
ners,
thing
merel
Kitch
(ii. 34
of Co
high
of Si
in 17
three
great
place
in Bu
to Ty
chari
only
the le
ticise
being
ing th
side
rather
really
it is
huma
ninet
they

A D

THE
writte
neces

refers to Byrom's well-known epigram on the King and the Pretender in a way which clearly shows that he had no acquaintance with the author or the intention of the lines (ii. 229). He would never have muddled up, as he has done, the Religious Societies and the Societies for the Reformation of Manners, which were in reality quite distinct institutions. These things make us doubt whether other little inaccuracies are merely slips of the pen, as, for instance, when he writes of John *Kitchen*, instead of *Kinchin*, as one of the Oxford Methodists (ii. 345), and when he refers to his becoming afterwards Dean of Corpus Christi College as if it were a promotion to some high ecclesiastical office like the Deanery of Christ Church; or of Sir William *Thornton*, instead of *Thornhill*, as a character in *The Vicar of Wakefield* (ii. 219); or, as he does two or three times, of 'the seventh day,' instead of the first, as the great day of Christian worship (ii. 51 and 59); or when he places Wentworth in Nottinghamshire (ii. 28) and Maidenhead in Buckinghamshire (ii. 32); or when he writes of the road to Tyburn as the *Via Dolorosa* (ii. 28), forgetting, we would charitably hope, that the expression is hallowed by one, and only one, application; or of the *Rechabites* when he means the leaders of the *Rebecca* riots (ii. 8). Mr. Sydney has criticised others so severely that he can hardly complain of being criticised himself. But we will end, as we began, by saying that he has done useful work by bringing out the dark side of the eighteenth century. Such a presentation, though rather saddening, teaches us that good work for God is never really lost, and that if we are indeed 'better than our fathers,' it is because the indefatigable exertions to improve the human race, which have certainly been a characteristic of the nineteenth century, have been blessed by Him for Whose sake they were made.

ART. X.—THE PROGRESS OF CLASSICAL STUDIES.

A Dictionary of Greek and Roman Antiquities. Edited by WILLIAM SMITH, LL.D., WILLIAM WAYTE, M.A., and G. E. MARINDIN, M.A. Third Edition, Revised and Enlarged. In Two Volumes. (London, 1890-91.)

THE history of classical studies in England has not yet been written; it would well repay the labour that would be necessary. We hope that it will not be long before some

scholar will be found ready to give himself to the work. It is a task for which none would have been so well suited as the late Mr. Mark Pattison. He could have traced, as few others could have done, the manner in which changes in religious and social life have caused men to turn to the study of classical antiquity with different objects and fresh purposes, and how the increase of scientific knowledge and the growth of a modern European literature have altered the position, without materially diminishing the importance of the classics in the sphere of letters and thought, and at the same time have shown how, throughout all the changes, there has been a constant progress in knowledge, and, perhaps we may add, an increase of understanding; so that the work of one generation always survives, though perhaps not sufficiently recognized by the next. More and Erasmus, Milton and Hobbes, Bentley and Gray approached the classics each from a different standpoint; and how great is the difference between the marvellous learning of Casaubon's time and the refined scholarship of the best Etonian versifiers.

A change equally great has taken place during this century, and is indeed even now in progress. We might describe it best by saying that classical studies are becoming less purely literary than they formerly were. It is of course true that it will always be the literature of Greece and Rome by which they will be best and most widely known. The value of Homer and Thucydides, of Catullus and Tacitus is absolute, and cannot be changed by any new discoveries or new additions to our knowledge. If they ever cease to be valued it will be when men have lost the power and understanding to appreciate them. If this ever happens it will matter little whether men pretend to study the Classics or not. But it is nevertheless true that new sides and aspects of ancient life are now being opened up. This is being done in two ways: to the literary study of antiquity we can now add the archaeological and historical.

Neither of these is of course entirely new. From the earliest days of the Renaissance, gems, coins, and statues were eagerly collected by the wealthy, and were used by the humanists to illustrate the Greek and Roman literature. The collection of inscriptions by Gruter, and Eckhel's monumental work on ancient coins have not yet lost their value. But still it remains true that till the last few years, at any rate in England, it has not been realized how important is the study of the actual remains of ancient art as an integral part of a classical education. Even now, how many boys go

thro
rant
supp
sam
alwa
conc
soci
and
we n
ance
The
1842
since
type
edito
two
said
time
by t
One
was
the l
the I
“
little
idea
about
labou
There
of G
from
and p
in an
Roma
accou
traor
Savig
which
cultiv
T
ginni
Sir G
publi
Since
of it

through their school and university education entirely ignorant of one whole side of that civilization which they are supposed to be studying. And with history it is much the same. Histories of Rome and Athens there have of course always been; but it is well to remember how modern is the conception of that scientific account of the growth of a society, founded on a careful examination of all the evidence, and enlightened by a comparison with other societies, which we now call history.

These considerations have been suggested by the appearance of a new edition of Smith's *Dictionary of Antiquities*. The first edition of this well-known work was published in 1842; 'the second, improved and enlarged, appeared in 1848; since which time the work has been reprinted from the stereotyped plates without alteration.' If we compare, as the editor does in his Preface, the state of classical learning forty-two years ago with that of the present time, what we have said will not appear exaggerated. It is true that at that time the great impulse given to classical studies in Germany by the pupils of Heyne had already produced great results. One of the chief merits of the older editions of this work was that it made accessible to English readers the results of the labours of Niebuhr, Savigny, and Boeckh. To quote from the Preface to the first edition:—

'The earlier writers on Greek and Roman antiquities display little historical criticism, and give no comprehensive view or living idea of the public and private life of the ancients. They wrote about antiquity as if the people had never existed. But by the labours of modern scholars life has been breathed into the study. There is scarcely a single subject included under the general name of Greek and Roman antiquities which has not received elucidation from the writings of the modern scholars of Germany. The history and political relations of the nations of antiquity have been placed in an entirely different light since the publication of Niebuhr's Roman history. The study of the Roman law, which has been unaccountably neglected in this country, has been prosecuted with extraordinary success by the great jurists of Germany, among whom Savigny stands pre-eminent. The study of ancient art likewise, to which our scholars have paid little attention, has been diligently cultivated in Germany from the time of Winckelmann and Lessing.'

The new epoch had begun in Germany; it was just beginning in England. The works of Arnold, Thirlwall, and Sir G. C. Lewis had already produced a great advance. The publication of this dictionary was itself a sign of the change. Since then an enormous amount of work has been done, most of it in Germany, much of it inaccessible to English readers.

If this new edition did nothing more than put in a simple and trustworthy form the results of the work of Mommsen, Curtius, and Kirchoff, as the old editions did that of their predecessors, it would fill a long felt want. We confess that we look on it as something more than this. We hope it is a sign that English scholars are beginning to meet the Germans on their own ground. In literary criticism we have always held our own; may we not hope that now in other fields, in history, in archaeology, in the history of religion and of private life—in all the various subjects, in fact, which are classed as antiquities—we may be no longer content with learning the results of German work, but may make our own the methods by which those results have been obtained.

In the Preface the editor calls our attention to the great addition to the sources of knowledge and the new methods of study discovered in these two years.

‘Epigraphy alone has revolutionized several departments of knowledge. The excavations of ancient sites have not only thrown new light upon the temples, tombs, theatres, and domestic architecture of the Greeks and Romans, but have yielded many treasures of art, pottery, and ornaments, illustrating the domestic life of the ancients.

‘The constitutional histories of Greece and Rome have been rewritten. When the last edition was published only a small part of the great work of Grote had appeared; this, since its completion, has now been supplemented by the researches of Ernest Curtius, Busolt, and others, while the works of Mommsen and his school have opened up new views of Roman Constitutional Law and provincial government. At the same time, the life of the Greeks and Romans, so long treated as the only “Ancients” worth studying, has come to be regarded less and less as an isolated group of phenomena. The application of the comparative method to history (including the history of religions) and philology has furnished a key to much that before seemed arbitrary and inexplicable. The phrases “Ancient Law” and “Primitive Culture” have acquired a new meaning at the hands of eminent writers.’

The appearance of these volumes will give us an opportunity of reckoning up the value of these advances, and also to some extent of considering how much of the work has been done in England. The list of contributors is a strong one, and though some eminent names are missing we must congratulate Dr. Smith and his fellow editors on having received the assistance of so many scholars of the first rank. The plan of the work is substantially the same as in the older editions, and in those subjects where great change was not necessary the old articles have been retained with little alteration. As before, the work

is a
advan
culty
occas
subje
in the
confu
with
really
as is
subje
tainly
‘Patri
it wou
trimon
Even
diversi
severel
articles
been av
ment.
article
‘Munic
on the
formati
is in its
it woul
had bee
to unde
‘Heres
inherita
tamentu
give a l
have sh
The
are a g
adopted
the ‘Pri
one of th
in Engli
Empero
growth o
The artic
is able to
We wish
VOL X

is alphabetical in arrangement. This has of course many advantages, but it must necessarily cause a good deal of difficulty in use. It is almost impossible to avoid repetition and occasionally some confusion of statement. In archæological subjects the advantages perhaps outweigh the disadvantages; in them any attempt at a formal classification easily leads to confusion. But in historical matters, and especially in dealing with constitutional questions, the alphabetical arrangement really has very serious drawbacks. These are increased when, as is too often the case in this edition, articles on kindred subjects have been written by different authors. It is certainly to be regretted, for instance, that the articles on 'Plebei,' 'Patricii,' 'Cliens,' are not all by the same writer; and again it would surely have been more satisfactory if those on 'Matrimonium' and 'Divortium' had both been by the same man. Even where actual contradiction is avoided there must be a diversity of treatment, and the writers themselves must be severely hampered by the necessity of constant reference to articles written by others. In some cases this difficulty has been avoided by practically giving up the alphabetical arrangement. A strict adherence to this would have required an article on each class of Roman towns, 'Colonia,' 'Præfectura,' 'Municipium.' Instead of this we have only one long article on the heading 'Colonia,' to which readers are referred for information on the other subjects. The necessity for this course is in itself an argument against the alphabetical arrangement; it would, we think, have been better if one or the other plan had been more uniformly followed. It is difficult, at any rate, to understand why in the case of Greek law one article on 'Heres' should include all information regarding the law of inheritance; while for Roman law an extra article on 'Testamentum' is added. In cases like this it is we think best to give a long and full explanation under one heading, and to have short supplementary articles by the same writer.

The articles on the constitution of the Roman Empire are a good illustration of the disadvantages of the system adopted. The most important is one by Professor Pelham on the 'Principatus'; this is in itself an admirable piece of work, one of the best in the book, and we find here for the first time in English a clear account of the constitutional position of the Emperor in the time of the early Empire, and of the gradual growth of monarchical forms out of the old republican equality. The article on 'Senatus' is by the same author, and in it he is able to explain the position of the Senate under the Empire. We wish particularly to call attention to these articles because

they are, what such articles ought to be, valuable pieces of original work, in which the author sums up all that has been said on the matter, but combines his summary with criticisms in such a way as to add something of permanent value to the literature of the subject. But if, having read about the theory of the Empire and the position of the Senate, we turn elsewhere to inquire what is said about the details of the administration and the duties of the Emperor, we find the articles written on a very different scale. There is, indeed, a good account of the 'Fiscus,' but the article on Imperial 'Constitutiones,' where we expect to find some account of the various duties of the Emperor, is very inadequate, and the information is not given elsewhere. Then, again, there is no information at all concerning the freedmen of the Imperial court, and the important offices held by them. It was a necessary result of the centralization of government in the hands of the Emperor that his private secretaries and clerks had really more power and influence than the most distinguished magistrates and generals. The wealth of Narcissus and the arrogance of Pallas are proverbial. These men, moreover, had very important duties to perform; the whole administration of the Empire passed through their hands. We may fairly expect in a dictionary of antiquities to find some detailed account of their duties and position; many a student will want to know what was the difference between the *Libertus* a *Libellis* and the *Libertus ab Epistolis*. He will look in vain for more than the barest mention of their names. This omission is particularly unfortunate, as the information is not to be found in English, though there is more than one German book which gives a full account of them. It would not have happened had all the articles on the Empire been written by the same man; when that on 'Procurator' is by one writer, that on 'Princeps' by another, that on 'Fiscus' by a third, that on 'Servus' and 'Libertus' by a fourth, it is not unnatural that an oversight like this should occur.

We have drawn attention to this group of articles as illustrating well the wants and defects of the work. There are in it many first-rate articles, some reaching a very high standard of excellence; but at the same time there seems to us to be a want of efficient editorial supervision, and not enough plan or purpose in the organization of the whole. Before passing on to other matters we will mention some other instances of this. The most serious omission is that there is no account of the history of writing, the origin of letters, or the alphabet; and a very meagre account even of the writing materials.

There
graphi
inform
time w
surely
slight
other
unable
arrange
And
on Gre
years h
Fustel
bringin
It is no
supplie
ment of
on the
the alm
Greek l
interest
points
more pe
contact
of Gree
closely
valuable
the Ary
advance
new imp
standing
so far a
orators
Various
knowled
important
Crete. I
tion con
gives at
punishme
date is
end of th
on the fac
town to p
the most

There is no article on manuscripts, or indeed on any palæographical subject. At the very least we should expect some information on the question of the origin of writing, and the time when it was introduced in Greece and Italy; and it is surely within the province of a book of this kind to give some slight help as to the different kinds of writing on stones and other materials. This omission, which we confess we are unable to understand, would not have occurred in a dictionary arranged on what the Germans call 'real' principles.

Another case of careless editing is to be found in the article on Greek Law. This is a subject on which the last forty years have thrown much new light. The labours of Maine and Fustel de Coulanges have explained much that was obscure by bringing it into connexion with the early law of other nations. It is no exaggeration to say that in many points Greek law supplies a most important link in the history of the development of Aryan peoples. The close resemblance that it bears on the one hand to much of the Hindoo law, and on the other the almost verbal agreement between some of the primitive Greek law and the earliest Teutonic codes, gives it a peculiar interest and value; a study of it throws much light on many points as to which that of the Roman law—which, though more perfect and complete, has just for that reason fewer points of contact with other systems—leaves unexplained. This position of Greek law is characteristic of all Hellenic civilization, and closely resembles that of the Greek language; it forms a valuable link between the Eastern and Western branches of the Aryan peoples. The recognition of this is one of the great advances made of late years in historical studies. It gives a new importance and interest to many matters the understanding of which had previously aroused little interest, except so far as it was necessary to a literary study of the Greek orators. This, however, is not the only advance in this subject. Various discoveries have been made which add greatly to our knowledge of the actual elements of Greek law. The most important of these is the great discovery made at Gortyn in Crete. Here Fabricius found engraved on a rock an inscription containing a nearly complete code of private law. It gives at length the rules regarding adoption, inheritance, punishment for assault, with the rules of procedure. The date is uncertain. It is at any rate not later than the end of the fifth century. Its importance, however, depends on the fact that it is apparently the first attempt made in this town to put the legal traditions into writing. It is, therefore, the most primitive code of Aryan law existing. It is scarcely

inferior in value to a complete copy of the Twelve Tables or of the Laws of Solon.

In view of this new knowledge we expect to find the articles on Greek law rewritten on some uniform plan, so as to bring them up to the level of present knowledge. The articles in the former editions, which were written by Mr. Kennedy, were excellent so far as they went, but they were too strictly confined to Attic law. They formed an admirable explanation of all the terms and procedure referred to in the orators, but nothing more than this. It is difficult to understand on what principle the editors have gone in dealing with them. In some cases the articles have been completely rewritten. There is, for instance, an admirable piece of work on *ἐπικληρος*, in which all the new knowledge is clearly dealt with, and a full, though discursive, article on 'Matrimonium.' On the other hand, the article on Inheritance (*Heres*) has been little changed, though a good deal of new information is added in footnotes, a plan which is not satisfactory. Lastly, the article on Adoption, though it has been revised by one of the editors, has been in no way materially altered; in it no account at all is taken of any law besides the Athenian, and the new knowledge is completely ignored.

It is now time to consider the extent of the changes made from the old edition. On the historical side the articles on Roman History, already referred to, are of the greatest importance. The work done by Mommsen and his assistants has completely altered the whole branch of knowledge. The changes are of two kinds. The systematic investigation of inscriptions has thrown light on all departments of administration, especially under the Empire, and the result of this has been completely to supersede all accounts of the Empire written before these new sources had been used. Besides being the first to use this, Mommsen has also brought a mind of singular power and legal acumen to the analysis of institutions, and has re-stated the theory of the Roman Constitution. The value of these two departments of his work, closely connected as they are, is of a somewhat different kind. The first part is a distinct addition to the collection of facts by the arrangement of which historical and legal knowledge is formed. Here there can be little to undo and no steps to retrace. The history of the Roman legions, as derived from the inscriptions set up in the various camps, once made out will not be altered except in minute points. We gain in the same way from the inscriptions which record their careers a knowledge of the duties and positions of the various Imperial

Procr
soldier
guishe
of all
their p
political
cannot
tions o
local a
friendly
cations
because
ment o
to whic
position

The
certain,
to aim
which s
soon y
stand th
is the m
and the
'Senatu
the reac
with ear
may giv
find it s
public l
statemen
are prof
never a
of view
position
clearly i
not so m
understa

It is
really re
pupils :
mary of
factory t
and in se
and imp
serve thi

Procurators, and of the fortunes of an ordinary Roman soldier. We now know something, not only of the distinguished and wealthy men of whom literature tells us, but also of all the obscure officials and private individuals who took their part in building up and keeping together that vast political edifice. Most of this is positive knowledge which cannot be overthrown. Other records tell us of the constitutions of the provincial cities, of the duties and anxieties of the local authorities, of the private societies for religious and friendly purposes; while the gravestones and religious dedications tell us of the religious belief and disbelief. It is because to him is chiefly due the accumulation and arrangement of all this material, and because he first saw the purpose to which it might be put, that Mommsen holds such a unique position.

The other form of advance, though less definite and less certain, is nearly as important. Mommsen is perhaps too apt to aim at forming a consistent and logical theory of facts which scarcely admit of such an explanation; and it is too soon yet to say how much of this constructive work will stand the test of time. There is, however, no doubt that his is the most brilliant attempt yet made to state the principles and theory of the government of Rome. In the articles on 'Senatus,' 'Patricii,' 'Consul,' 'Imperator,' and many others, the reader will find the result of this work, and a comparison with earlier editions will show how great the change is. We may give an instance. In the second edition the reader will find it stated that to some extent the Senate under the Republic had legislative authority; in the new edition this statement is directly contradicted, and for reasons which are probably conclusive it is shown that this power was never attained till the time of the Empire. This change of view depends on a complete re-statement of the whole position of the Senate, which for the first time puts it in a clearly intelligible light. This, however, has been attained not so much by the accumulation of new facts as by a greater understanding of what was before known.

It is not surprising that the articles on these subjects are really reproductions of the work done by Mommsen and his pupils: that on 'Magistratus' is, in fact, we are told, a summary of one of the volumes of his *Staatsrecht*. It is satisfactory to find that the work has generally been well done, and in some cases, as we have already said, contains original and important criticisms. For the purposes that it has to serve this will not detract from its value; for the editors have

the advantage of putting for the first time before the English reader much information which has long been almost indispensable to scholars. Hitherto, strange as it may seem, there has been no work where could be found a satisfactory account of the constitution of the Empire. These articles alone are sufficient to show how necessary a new edition of this work had become.

Turning to Greek history, we find that the advances have been only partially of the same kind. There, as in Roman history, the use of inscriptions has been greatly developed, and the information gained from them has made it necessary to rewrite the articles on nearly all political antiquities. One important result of this new source of information is that we now know much more than was formerly the case of other states besides Athens. In the old days the history of Greece was identified with that of two or three leading states. Now we can to some extent learn what was the government and the life in the innumerable small states of which literature tells us so little. This new matter is fairly given, though we could wish in some cases that it had been better worked up, and not merely added to the old article, as has been done. This is to some extent a result of the fact that there has not been anyone working at Greek history who has so dominated the subject as has Mommsen in Roman history. Grote wrote before inscriptions were generally used, and tended to undervalue them; Curtius's greatest achievements are in the sphere of art and archæology rather than that of history and law. The real founder of modern Greek history was Boeckh. His work was already available to the writers in the former edition, and since his time no one else has mastered and arranged the new knowledge as he did with what was available at his time. Hence the writers in the new edition have either to be content with stating the various facts on which theories can be founded, or, if they attempt to arrange and organize them, can only give the most important of the numerous theories which are held on all points of Greek history. It is, therefore, more difficult now to get a general view of Greek history than of Roman. The knowledge here has in some cases outstripped the power of assimilation; in others, it is still too fragmentary to be the foundation of any certain theory. If, therefore, the articles on Greek history are not always so satisfactory as those on Roman, the writers are not responsible for the difference. In both cases the work fairly represents the present conditions of knowledge. More we cannot expect.

In
more c
sites is
leading
occupie
logical
in form
literary
able no
from th
This is
number
is inter
sites an
that a
more m
scientific

The
in the
the wr
descrip
ton is a
who wa
is not a
his time
remains
is the
interest
has dis
was, for
optical
ings; b
and oth
accurate
was a r
slightly
which v
bottom
lines of
lines an
appear
a colon
than the
reduced
from ap

In many of the archæological articles, however, we find more originality. The discovery and excavation of ancient sites is a work in which Englishmen have always taken a leading place, and the investigation of the results has lately occupied an increasing number of scholars. In these archæological articles the great change to be remarked is that, while in former editions the writers depended almost entirely on literary sources such as Vitruvius and Pausanias, they are able now to supplement and correct the information derived from them by the observation of actually existing remains. This is, of course, to a great extent the result of the great number of excavations which have of late been made ; but it is interesting to observe that it is not only in the number of sites and objects observed, but in the method of observation, that a change has taken place. Investigation has become more minute and more critical ; archæology has entered on a scientific stage.

The most interesting example of this is perhaps to be found in the article on 'Temples' by Professor Middleton. While the writer in the old edition draws his classification and descriptions almost entirely from Vitruvius, Professor Middleton is able in many places to correct his account. Vitruvius, who was much more a practical architect than an antiquarian, is not always an infallible guide as to buildings which even in his time had become old. A list of thirty-five temples, the remains of which are open to examination, shows how large is the material now open to archæologists. It is of great interest to read how the careful examination of these remains has disclosed unlooked-for secrets of the Greek builders. It was, for instance, known before that the Greeks used many optical refinements to improve the appearance of their buildings ; by a series of careful measurements of the Parthenon and other temples made by Mr. Penrose these can now be accurately described. The best known is the *entasis* ; it was a rule of the builders to make the columns of a temple slightly convex, so as to avoid the appearance of weakening which would result if the diameter diminished regularly from bottom to top. On a similar principle the main horizontal lines of a temple were made slightly convex, and all vertical lines and planes received an inward slope so as to give an appearance of stability. Again, the columns at the angles of a colonnade surrounding a temple were made slightly thicker than the rest, and the inter-columniations at the angles were reduced. The object of this was to prevent the angle columns from appearing thinner than the others on account of their

being seen against a brighter background than those which showed against the cella walls. Well may Professor Middleton say 'The very elaborate system of curved lines and inclined axes which the highly sensitive eye of the Greek thought necessary to the beauty of a building shows more clearly than anything else how far superior to ours were the æsthetic perceptions and the delicately trained eyesight of the ancient Greek.' Of all the many optical refinements of the Greek the *entasis* is the only one which is used in modern buildings. This is a useful instance of the way in which the minute and critical work of modern archæologists adds in an important way to our appreciation of the peculiarities of Greek civilization. The editors have been very fortunate in securing for this and many other articles a writer of such wide knowledge of architecture and an intimate acquaintance with his subject as Professor Middleton. His articles on 'Pons,' 'Murus,' 'Templum,' are full of valuable information on the methods of building.

Another instance of this careful examination of buildings is to be found in the article on the 'Theatre' by Professor Jebb. In it we find a clear summary of the results of recent investigations, and though in this case some of the most important questions are still unsolved, much light has already been thrown on the manner in which plays were produced from the earliest times. Here again it is the work done at Athens—in this case by the head of the German school of archæology, Dr. Dörpfeld—which has been of most use. Professor Jebb does not, indeed, adopt his theory that in the theatre of the fourth century there was no stage, but that the actors and chorus stood together in a circular orchestra; his summary of the question shows, however, how important are the observations on which the theory is founded. The arguments are founded chiefly on the results of the excavations made at Athens in the great theatre of Dionysius by Dr. Dörpfeld himself, and in the theatres discovered at Eretria, Megalopolis, &c. The doubts arise chiefly from the difficulty of reconciling these remains with the accounts of buildings given by Vitruvius. These excavations have been made chiefly by the directors and students of the schools established at Athens by various countries, and it is to the permanent co-operation at the same place of so many scholars that the great improvement in method is doubtless due. The French and German schools are supported by their respective governments; it is to be hoped that private generosity will continue to enable the British school to maintain the position

that
volum
is; th
lishm

If
ledge
of art
learn
the se
to the
pages
is sup
clay u
has b
on ac
becau
is a v
subje
a wel
differ
study
earlie
of or
many
exam
the i
before
tional
shown
that
other
possib
unorm
the R
work
dates
find a
civiliz
ledge
tage;
result
dange
instan
excav
Petrie

that it has hitherto occupied. The publication of these volumes is alone sufficient to show how important their work is; they also show how much of it has been done by Englishmen.

If the articles on buildings show an advance of knowledge, still more striking are those dealing with smaller works of art. Here we come across a whole new department of learning, which has been created in these last few years. In the second edition of this work only a few lines were devoted to the subject of 'Vases'; now Mr. Tubbs requires thirteen pages in order to give a short outline of the subject, and this is supplemented by an account of the methods of working clay under 'Fictile.' The scientific study of vase paintings has become of late years of considerable importance, not only on account of the artistic value of the ornamentations, but because in many cases the treatment of myths by the artists is a valuable illustration of the literary treatment of the same subjects. In them it is often possible to trace the growth of a well-known legend, and to recognize the introduction of different elements in the story. For early history also the study of vases and pottery is no less important; in the earliest ornamented pottery we can see the first introduction of oriental influence, and much of the history and life of many buried and forgotten cities can be rescued by a careful examination of broken potsherds. For the prehistoric period the indestructible nature of pottery, and its extensive use before metals were common, make these remains of exceptional value. It is chiefly by the different degrees of skill shown in the baking and ornamentation of the pottery used that the relative ages of the cities at Troy, Mycenæ, and other places can be determined. And as it becomes more possible to trace a continued development from the unbaked, unornamented utensils of the early cities of Troy through the Rhodian, Cyprian, and Mycenæan ware to the beautiful work of historic times, we may be able to affix some definite dates to the manufacture of each kind, and in consequence to find an approximate date for the first beginnings of Hellenic civilization. The very rapidity in the increase of our knowledge on these subjects, indeed, puts the writers at a disadvantage; they have, however, succeeded in finding room for the results of the very latest discoveries, without falling into the danger of accepting all the latest theories. We find, for instance, a sufficient account of the results of the latest excavations at Cyprus, and of the discoveries by Dr. Flinders Petrie at Naucratis and elsewhere. His last results, by

which he professes to have found evidence of connexion between Egypt and an *Ægean* civilization of a date before 2000 B.C., have come too late for use. Some time must yet elapse before the value of the arguments drawn from the evidence can be rightly judged; it is sufficient that we find here an accurate and full account of the evidence itself.

It would, indeed, be impossible to give even a list of all the new matters which are dealt with in these volumes. We find a careful article on 'Terracotta' to which there is no parallel in the old editions; for much of the material has been provided by the new discoveries at Tanagra of those domestic images now so well known. The articles on money ('Nummus,' 'Pondera,' 'Moneta') have been completely rewritten, and in this case we are glad to say have all been entrusted to the same writer, Professor Percy Gardner. Here the attention is naturally arrested by the attempt to trace the origin of the weights and measures of value among the Greeks, as in so many other cases we can now work by examination of the actual objects, and can make a comparison of Greek coins with the actual weights used in Babylon, Egypt, and Phœnicia. In this department it is the investigation of the older civilizations of Asia that has thrown much light on doubtful points of Greek life, and even if a final solution of the origin of the chief Greek standards has not yet been attained, there is every hope that perseverance in this method will lead to a definite result.

We have said enough to show how great has been the progress of knowledge in the last forty years, and it will, we hope, be clear how important this knowledge is. We know now far more than was formerly known of the life and writings of the Greeks and Romans. Before we had their works before us: their literature, their art, their law, their political achievements. Now we can see not only what they did, but how they did it. We are introduced to the administration of the Roman Empire and to Athenian democracy, we can examine the accounts and assist at the audit of the magistrates. The methods which produced the building of the Greek temples and the Roman aqueducts are disclosed to us, and we can trace from the earliest times the growth of the artistic spirit which produced the finest types of coins and the most perfect vases. But if we are thus let into the secrets of ancient life and penetrate behind the scenes, it will not become less but more valuable. We learn more and more clearly that the great secret of Greek superiority was a marvellous power of refined perception joined to great vigour

and
beco
spen
when
the
tain

Rom
the
in t
their
worl
The
men
an a
soon
latic
expl
mar
and
myt
anal
but
and
part
find
ing
'Ora
the

of g
ther
all
Gree
pris
necl
all v
not
know
depa
a ki
welc
reac
inte
we

and perseverance in execution. The Parthenon does not become less valuable to us when we know all the labour spent on its erection, nor the power of Rome less marvellous when we disinter by the banks of the Danube and the Dee the evidence of the care and labour by which it was maintained.

The second great advance is the comparison of Greece and Rome with other nations ; it discloses to us the solidarity of the ancient civilization of which each was only a part. It is in the history of religion that this is most apparent, and also their difference from us ; this only comes partially into this work, though it occupies some articles, *e.g.* that on the Thesmophoria, and of course the ceremonial and establishment of religion is fully dealt with. In this case, it is perhaps an advantage that the new edition has not been published sooner. The history of religions is fruitful in such speculations. Twenty years ago solar myths were the received explanations for all difficulties ; all strange customs and marvellous stories were looked on as coming from a higher and purer state. Now we are taught to see in ritual and mythology relics of a barbarous state, and to find their analogies, not in the speculations of poets and philosophers, but in the obscene habits and childish stories of Bushmen and Patagonians. This belongs, as a rule, more to the department of mythology than antiquities. In this book we find, however, the account of a certain number of rites belonging to the more celebrated temples, and a long article also on 'Oracles.' We do not, however, quite gather on what principle the line has been drawn.

We have, of course, only been able to touch on the parts of greatest importance. Those who consult this work for themselves will find in it plenty of information on points of all kinds ; how the Romans played backgammon, and the Greeks played at Cottabos, and how the Greeks put their prisoners to death, the equipment of a trireme and a lady's necklace, music and astronomy, mathematics and anatomy—all will be found here. There are few points in which it will not be found that the last forty years have added much to our knowledge. We hope we have shown that at least in some departments the new knowledge is both important and of such a kind as to add to the influence of classical studies. We welcome this book as a means of putting this within the reach of a large public, to whom they have the greatest interest. When the study of classics is assailed, and when we are so continually told that their time is past, the best

answer is to show that the value and teaching of Hellenism is increasing and not decreasing. Old truths have to be re-stated to each age in a new way. It is no unimportant matter that the researches of scholars should be made available to the larger reading public.

ART. XI.—THE CHURCH MISSIONARY SOCIETY AND PROSELYTISM.

1. *The Archbishop's Letter to the Patriarch of Antioch.* *The Guardian*, October 7, 1891.
2. *The Lambeth 'Advice.'* *The Guardian*, September 9, 1891.
3. *The Church Missionary Intelligencer*, October, 1891.

AN institution cradled in controversy may sometimes pass, in the course of years, into a peaceable and quiescent maturity. More commonly its future history is coloured by the passions of its origin. They have stamped a character upon it which cannot be effaced. The particular disputes that waited on its birth may be forgotten, but others gather round it, and the new controversy insensibly takes its colour from the old.

Such has been the history of the 'Jerusalem Bishopric,' and such it seems likely to remain. The original vice of its foundation—that which had so disastrous an effect on Mr. Newman—is a thing of the past. It no longer brings us into relations with the 'Evangelical' Establishment of Prussia. When this connexion was broken by the death of Bishop Gobat, when, a few years later, the Prussian Government renounced all further interest in the bishopric, when the question of its continuance thus came to be considered, there was a new objection to be overcome. Our relations with the Orthodox Church were now in controversy.

It is needless to recall the circumstances of the controversy. They are fresh in the memory of all who take any interest in the matter. For our present purpose we are concerned with only two of the reasons urged against the bishopric, and with one of these but slightly.

It was not the work of the English Church to evangelize the unbelieving population of Palestine. It was the Patriarch of Jerusalem and his clergy who were called and sent for that work. If individual Englishmen had a vocation to help in the work they should put themselves under the direction of

the
rece
Ang

Pale
with
pros
pres
bish
was
and

his i
ther
of c
have
wou
with
that
migh
mak

obl
by t
dire
hope
hist
of C
East
have
unde
men
his
schis

The
bish
term
with
pow
form
but
last
Bly
whil

the Orthodox Eastern Church, from which alone they could receive due mission. There was, therefore, no room for an Anglican bishop to superintend such work.

But again, the English clergymen already established in Palestine under pretext of such mission work were charged with actual aggression on the Orthodox Church. They were proselytizing from her. The bishops, moreover, who had presided over them were subject to the same charge. The bishopric was fully associated with schismatical action. This was ingrained in its traditions. It was not merely needless and irregular, it was positively mischievous.

When the Archbishop of Canterbury in 1887 announced his intention of consecrating a successor to Bishop Barclay, there was in some quarters an inclination to close the chapter of criticism. The clergyman appointed was understood to have no sympathy with the policy of his predecessors. He would put a stop to all proselytizing. He would live in amity with the Oriental hierarchy. A hope was freely expressed that the bishopric, the source of so much mischief in the past, might in the future become an instrument of good, might make for reunion with the ancient Churches of the East.

We did not share this hope. History is not so easily obliterated. A false step in one direction does not become, by the expression of a pious wish, an advance in the opposite direction. Yet there were some slight grounds for such a hope. There was at least a new departure taken in the history of the bishopric. It was stated that the Archbishop of Canterbury was acting with the full concurrence of the Eastern Patriarchs. The revival of the bishopric was said to have been even asked for by the Patriarch of Jerusalem. It was understood that Bishop Blyth was the bearer of letters commendatory to the heads of the Orthodox Church, which placed his mission on a satisfactory footing, clear of any taint of schism.

It would have been well if these letters had been published. They might not have reconciled us to the continuance of the bishopric, but they would have made us acquainted with the terms under which it was revived. We should have known with what intention Bishop Blyth was consecrated, and what powers and functions he was intended to exercise and to perform. From what we now know of these letters, we cannot but infer that had they been published the controversies of the last four years would have taken a different turn, that Bishop Blyth himself would have acted in a somewhat different way, while the English clergymen in Palestine, whose conduct has

been impugned, even if they had not modified their conduct, would probably have defended it by different pleas.

As a consequence of the disputes of the last year one of these letters has been published.¹ It is the letter addressed to the Patriarch of Antioch, on the Feast of the Annunciation, 1887; an official copy was obtained from the Patriarchate, certified by the keeper of the Archives and by the British consul at Beyrut. It is a document that merits attention; indeed without it we cannot properly understand the situation in which affairs now stand. We must turn to this letter if we would know how and for what purpose Bishop Blyth was sent into the East; we must have it before us when we try to judge how far that purpose is likely to be realized; and for what concerns our present purpose, we must have it in view when we try to estimate the value of later utterances of its writer. Two features of the letter are specially noteworthy.

I. The Archbishop addresses the Patriarch in terms which imply an absolute solidarity between their respective Churches. It is a 'brotherly greeting.' It recites the 'assent and consent' of the Patriarch of Jerusalem, who is 'our brother in the rule of the Church of God.' The two Churches are spoken of, indirectly but not obscurely, as *one Flock*. No stranger to ecclesiastical history reading this letter would suppose that anything more than a slight breach of charity had ever marred the union of these two parts of Christendom.

II. The duties of the Bishop, again, are defined in this letter in a notable way. Not a word is said about that mission work among Jews and Mohammedans, of which so much had been made in previous discussions. The Bishop is sent simply 'to have the charge and oversight of the English clergy and congregations' scattered throughout the East. He is 'the representative within the Patriarchate of Jerusalem of ourselves and of our Church,' but he is 'not to use any style or title of Bishop of Jerusalem, or any insignia indicating territorial jurisdiction or authority in the East.' Furthermore, 'his desire and study' will be '*in the first place*, to give loving tokens, by his conduct and conversation, of that fraternal desire for union between the Orthodox Church of the East and the Church of England, which many faithful members in both Churches . . . have often spoken of with yearning hearts.' In the second place, he is to render help and support 'against encroaching Churches and aggressive organizations,' and he 'will steadily reprove and discountenance all attempts at proselytism from the Orthodox Church of the East.'

¹ In the *Guardian* of October 7.

Such was the tenor of the Archbishop's letters. It would be hard to find a fault in them. They recognize no intrusion into the dioceses of the East. They point to no independent mission of English clergymen. They treat the Orthodox Church as in sole possession of the ground. There are some scattered English clergymen and congregations there—as where are there not?—but they are spoken of merely as sojourners among friends. A bishop is sent to have the charge and oversight of them, but he is not sent as with formal mission to exercise jurisdiction. This, indeed, is expressly barred. The jurisdiction of the Eastern Bishops is on no account to be infringed. His mission is, indeed, to the Patriarchs themselves. He goes as an ambassador. He is the representative at the Patriarchal Court of the Archbishop of Canterbury and the English Episcopate; and to English residents in the Patriarchate he stands in spiritual things as the ambassador of the Queen stands to them in temporal things. He is to fight against schismatical intruders, but even here he is not to act on his own initiative. He is simply to give the Orthodox hierarchy what help and support he may.

It would be impossible to imagine anything more satisfactory than this, *if only there were no history behind*. If these letters were the inauguration of a new scheme, they would be sufficient. But Bishop Blyth did not descend on Palestine like a meteorolite. He stepped into a determinate position. He was consecrated under the 'Jerusalem Bishopric Act.' He was sent as the successor of Bishops Gobat and Barclay. He had to gather up their threads, to carry on their work—with a difference, no doubt, in a different temper, on different principles, but without any breach of continuity. If the 'Jerusalem Bishopric' had been allowed to lapse entirely, if all its evil traditions had been broken, then, after an interval of some years, it would have been safe to send into Palestine such an ecclesiastical ambassador, such a *legatus a latere* as is here conceived. But to send Bishop Blyth on such an errand, weighted with the traditions of the bishopric, was to send him to failure.

Still, if he had carried these documents as open letters, his impossible task would at least have been lightened. His position and his mission would have been plainly irreconcilable, and he might have chosen between them. But he went without explanation, and found himself in the hopeless tangle which might have been expected. He wavered between his position and his mission. He took the oversight of the

Church Missionary Society's work, about which nothing was said in his letters commendatory. He thus involved himself with the very men who were charged with that proselytism which he was to reprove and discountenance. He reported, within his first year of office, that, so far as he could see, the charge was unfounded. He was not in fault—he was the victim of his position. How could he denounce at once the work of his predecessors? At the same time he struggled to fulfil his mission. He entered into the friendliest relations with the Orthodox Bishops. He seems to have submitted questions of discipline to them. He has told us¹ that he felt bound to accept their view. As a result, he came into collision with the Church Missionary Society on the question of Confirmation.

It is not our intention to go into the details of the controversy that arose between the Bishop and the Society. Some of them are trivial, some are of the greatest moment. We deal at present with only one, nor indeed are we concerned even with this one as a question at issue between these two parties. It has attained a wider interest. It is the question of proselytism. Bishop Blyth was at length convinced that the charge of proselytism was proved. He laid the charge himself, and pressed it home. It was taken up in England, and, as everyone knows, it came, with several other matters, before the Archbishop of Canterbury, sitting with assessors in semi-judicial state. In August last the Primate and his assessors published their findings in the form of a Letter of Advice.

This 'Advice' the Society claims as a verdict of complete acquittal. It was discussed in the October number of the *Church Missionary Intelligencer* in a tone of hardly subdued exultation. Alike in regard to other complaints, and to this of proselytism, the charges against the Society were all dismissed. Such is the view of the Society. The Bishop, on the other hand, maintains (in a letter to the *Guardian* of October 28) that 'no single charge or statement has been disproved or dismissed.' The 'Advice' would seem to be somewhat ambiguous, if it can be thus diversely interpreted. Turning to the text, we find a possible explanation of this uncertainty. We find that the Archbishop and his assessors do not use the word *proselytism* at all. They speak of 'systematic aggression on the Churches of the East'; they note that the Society repudiates any 'employment of agents for aggressive purposes.' We do not find any statement of

¹ *Guardian*, October 7. Statement by Bishop Blyth.

their
Bish
cila
the p
suad
good

T
but
The
tant,
publi
detai
They
with
so to
view
endea
to rel
the G
thus
they
be ca
Churc
mits i
the w

On
prosel
Societ
seems
to the
least
then h

Pr
certain
Yet w
a sou
conver
word
a conv
been
making
Bishop
Church
cisely
he me
VOL

their own opinion. They have heard the Society and the Bishop, and they consider their views not hopelessly irreconcilable. They 'think that personal explanation has smoothed the principal difficulties of the situation.' They 'are persuaded that as difficult cases arise, mutual intelligence and goodwill promise all needful solutions.'

There is certainly no condemnation of the Society here; but neither is there a clear dismissal of any definite charges. The explanations offered are simply accepted. It is important, therefore, to look at those explanations. They are published by the Society in the *Intelligencer*. They are detailed and rather diffuse, but they can easily be summarized. They amount to this. The Society has no desire to interfere with Oriental Christians; if any such interference occur, it is, so to say, accidental. Agents are appointed solely with a view to the conversion of Mohammedans. To this end they endeavour to stir up the zeal of the Eastern Christians, and to reform whatever abuses among them hinder the spread of the Gospel. It will happen at times that Easterns who are thus aroused wish to worship with the missionaries. Then they are allowed to do so. The Society denies that this can be called proselytism and 'systematic aggression on the Churches of the East.' Indeed, Bishop Blyth himself permits it, though he has some difference with the Society as to the way in which the work is to be done.

One thing is much to be desired here—a definition of proselytism. We should then see more clearly what the Society meant in denying the charge. Bishop Blyth as well seems to have shrunk from a definition. But if the parties to the arbitration could not produce a definition, the Court at least might have given us one. The Letter of Advice would then have had a value beyond its immediate use.

Proselytism is a crime to which no one pleads guilty. It certainly is a crime; for everyone indignantly repudiates it. Yet we cannot very well say why the word should have so ill a sound. A 'proselyte' after all is exactly the same as a *convert*. The tyranny of usage, however, has fastened on the word an evil meaning. A proselyte has come to mean either a convert who ought not to have been made, or one who has been made by objectionable methods. Proselytism means making converts under unseemly circumstances. When Bishop Blyth brought his charge of proselytism against the Church Missionary Society, he ought to have told us precisely what were the unseemly circumstances of the case. If he meant that converts were received who ought not to be

received at all, he should have said so; if he meant that unworthy methods were employed, he should have specified them. The Society, in replying to the charge, was not, indeed, bound to supply the definition. It was enough to say, as they said in effect: 'This is what we do, and this is not proselytism.'

This was enough, but the inquiry would have led to a much more useful end if the charge had been more definitely faced, if the Society had said: 'This we understand by proselytism, and this we have not done.' Lastly, the arbitrators have perhaps pronounced on what was before them, but they would have played a more useful part if they had gone outside of the case as presented, if they had defined the offence, and on the ground of their definition had acquitted or condemned the Society.

They have not done this, and therefore their advice has concluded nothing. A vague charge was made; it seems to have been too vague to be proved, and the accuser is able to say that neither has it been disproved nor dismissed.

If the Society neglected to supply the Court with a definition it was not for lack of ability. The *Intelligencer* for October, which sets out the Society's view of the Advice, has a further article entitled, 'What is Proselytism?' The first thought that occurs to the reader is that the article is two months overdue. It ought to have appeared before or during the inquiry. We look into it with some curiosity to see in what sense the Society repudiated proselytism. It must be said that, as we read, curiosity deepens into suspicion. Was this the sense in which it was repudiated? Was the meaning of the denial made clear to the arbitrators? Is this what they mean when they dismiss—if they do dismiss—the charge? The Society claims to have been acquitted of proselytism, and then proceeds to explain what proselytism is. We are first told that the methods of the Society are approved by the Lambeth Bishops, and then we are told frankly what the methods of the Society are. We are meant to read the two articles together. Their conjunction has no point, unless it be to suggest that the methods here described are those which were approved.

The proselytism which the Society disavows is this: 'the mere winning of adherents from one Church to another' or 'bribing people, directly or indirectly, to join our Communion.' The agents of the Society do not go to Eastern Christians and say: 'Come out of the Church and join us: the Temple of the Lord are we. In other words, they do not proclaim

182
tha
the
do

Pre
like
they
ther
ther
title
char
Still
the
com
plan
East
they
no r
lated
frank
sions
East
prose
to le
thing
him
of ha
quest
of th
some
'Adv
laid
assess
judge
be 'p
self re
men s
'Adv
Intelli
with t
possib
Bishop
public.
Societ
Fo

that in their congregations alone salvation is to be found. If they did, then they would be guilty of proselytizing. As they do not act in this way, they repudiate the charge.

We are then gravely expected to believe that the five Prelates who sat in arbitration were satisfied with puerilities like these. When they acquitted the Society of proselytism they merely meant that the Society's agents do not behave themselves in the absurd way here described, do not claim for themselves an exclusive possession of the truth, an exclusive title to salvation. As no one ever brought so ridiculous a charge against the Society, there was no need to answer it. Still, if the Society chooses thus to whittle away to nothing the meaning of a favourable verdict, no one else need so far complain. But the gist of the article lies really in the explanation of what the Society does. The Society preaches to Eastern Christians in such a strain that as a practical result they do 'come out of the Church and join us.' And this is no mere accidental result. It is a foreseen result, a calculated result. 'We earnestly hope,' says the writer, 'and we frankly express the hope, that conversions—true conversions to Christ—may yet bring many members of the corrupt Eastern Churches into our purer Communion.' So then it is proselytism, and a thing to be abhorred, if you invite a man to leave his Church and join yours; it is a pious and holy thing to preach to him in a way that you hope will induce him to do so. Here is a distinction subtle indeed—a man of hasty speech might call it a flagrant equivocation. The question before us, however, concerns not the interior morality of the Church Missionary Society, but the relation of this somewhat belated exposition of principles to the Lambeth 'Advice.' A hope is expressed here frankly enough. Was it laid with equal frankness before the Archbishop and his assessors? In their 'Advice' they record that the Society judges the formation of small congregations of proselytes to be 'practically unavoidable.' They note that the Bishop himself regards the reception of individuals as 'inevitable.' Do men so speak of a thing hoped for? The language of the 'Advice' is altogether inconsistent with the language of the *Intelligencer*. Yet the Prelates declared themselves satisfied with the explanations of the Society. There is only one possible inference. The explanations offered to the Court of Bishops were not consistent with those now offered to the public. The Advice was not tendered in the sense which the Society tries to put upon it.

For if it were tendered in this sense, let us see to what

conclusions we are driven. It is necessary here to recall the terms of the Archbishop's letter to the Patriarch, quoted above. This letter, we saw, acknowledged a perfect solidarity of interest between the two Churches—a perfect unity of faith, even if there be some interruption of active union. The Patriarch and the Archbishop are 'brothers in the rule of the Church of God;' there are 'faithful members in both Churches' who desire a more perfect union. It is clear that language like this does not debar, but rather encourages, the occasional transfer of an individual from the worship of the one Church to that of the other. Convenience of time or place, the needs and opportunities of work to be done, might render such transference desirable or 'practically unavoidable.' But it absolutely debars all mention of 'conversion' from one Church to the other. If, then, the Lambeth 'Advice' is to be interpreted in the sense of the Church Missionary Society, the Archbishop is involved in a hopeless contradiction.

Again, the language of the letter to the Patriarch is consistent with a recognition of practical corruptions in the Eastern Church. What Church is without them? It may be in grievous need of reformation. The English Church may possibly be a 'purer Communion.' But can the Prelate who wrote that letter justify secession from the one Church to the other? They are conceived as two parts of 'one Flock.' The Church Missionary Society sees no difficulty here. The Eastern Church is so utterly corrupt that no man once enlightened can stay within; he is bound to seek our purer communion. But the Archbishop does not so view the Eastern Church. He knows of no vital differences between the two Churches; for if there were vital differences he could not write in such terms as we have read. If, then, he allows secession, he allows it on the ground of differences which are not vital. But this is precisely the Dissidence of Dissent. The question here is not whether dissidence is a good thing or an evil. The question is whether the Archbishop can be supposed to uphold it. By English dissenters it is strenuously upheld as a sacred principle, and the most unyielding Churchman may allow that a fair case can be made out for it. But it is not a principle that is acknowledged in the English Church; it is, indeed, the most prominent issue between the Church and Dissent. The meaning of Dissidence is that men who think alike should worship together; that men who differ should organize themselves in separate communities. In this way disputes will lose their acrimony and charity will most abound. The Church, on the other hand, maintains that all

Christian men, whether they differ or agree, should continue in the same community and join in common worship. Her congregations are ordered by territorial divisions, which theoretically may not be transgressed. All should worship in the parish church; and as the taste and preferences of all cannot possibly be followed, a common order is provided to which all are to conform. Nothing short of the most vital necessity can justify the breach of this external unity.

There can be no question that such are the principles of the English Church. They were maintained as long as possible by force. They underlie the Act of Uniformity. They inspired the intolerant legislation of the seventeenth century. That weapon broke in the Church's hand, and perhaps no Churchman would care to wield it now. But though no longer upheld by force, these principles are still retained. The whole organization of the Church assumes them, rests on them.

We are bound to suppose that the Archbishop gave his ruling in accordance with these principles. The Church Missionary Society may renounce them—nay, we need make no conjecture—they are renounced. The *Intelligencer* boldly adopts a parallel. The Society in Palestine is in the position of a Dissenting body in an English parish. What is right for the one is right, on dissident principles, for the other. The converts of the Society are strictly analogous to those whom the Dissenting minister draws by his earnest preaching from the parish church. But no one can suppose that the Archbishop of Canterbury accepts the principle of Dissidence. It would be as reasonable to expect the Congregational Union to adopt the principle of Conformity.

It is, therefore, impossible to believe that the principles enunciated in the *Church Missionary Intelligencer* are approved in the Lambeth 'Advice.' But this is not all. It is inconceivable that if these principles had been acknowledged before the inquiry they would have been passed over in silence. Why was not this definition of proselytism put forward sooner? Why was not this frank acceptance of the principle of Dissidence made known before? Why were these hopes of a plentiful harvest of conversions so discreetly veiled? The arbitrators have been played with. They gave their verdict on the case before them. Another case is now produced and paraded as the foundation of the verdict. An acquittal was obtained by a suppression of certain facts, and those facts are afterwards put forward as covered by the acquittal.

It will easily be understood that we do not write in defence of the Lambeth 'Advice.' It contains much that we regard with the gravest apprehension. It seems to us to justify every objection which was brought against the revival or continuance of the 'Jerusalem Bishopric.' It shows that, however good may have been the intention of the revival, the bishopric is burdened by its history and bound by its antecedents. No one can doubt the excellent motives and sound principles which have governed the conduct of Bishop Blyth; and which find expression in the Charge to which we called attention in a previous number of this *Review*. No one, again, can doubt the goodwill of the Archbishop of Canterbury towards the Eastern Church, his devotion to the cause of union, his belief in the Apostolic order of the Church. But when he has to deal with this perilous institution he is hampered by precedent, and tied by the vested interests of schism. We deplore this Advice, as we deplore the circumstances which called it forth. But we cannot ignore it, and we cannot allow it to be worsened by a disingenuous interpretation. To the agents of the Church Missionary Society we make a present of all in their favour which it contains, but we cannot allow them to claim it as condoning everything which they do. We must insist on its being interpreted not as an isolated pronouncement, but in the light of other documents, in which are defined with official sanction the relations of the English Church to the Eastern Patriarchs. The Jerusalem Bishopric, if it be not speedily dissolved, has the promise of many further troubles to the Church, but at least we will not have those which it now brings sharpened by the ingenuity of the fautors of disunion.

SHORT NOTICES.

The Law in the Prophets. By the Rev. STANLEY LEATHES, D.D., Professor of Hebrew, King's College, London; Prebendary of St. Paul's; Rector of Much Hadham, Herts; Honorary Fellow of Jesus College, Cambridge. (London: Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1891.)

A SCHOOL of modern criticism regards the Jewish Law in anything like its complete state as later than the majority of the prophets. An important part of the consideration of this theory from the critical point of view lies in the comparison of the language and allusions found in the prophets with the words and history contained in

the Pentateuch. If it can be shown on the one hand that the passages in the prophets which are sometimes thought to indicate ignorance of the Law can be explained consistently with its existence, and on the other hand that there is much in the writings of the prophets a reasonable interpretation of which points to a knowledge of the Pentateuch, a very formidable argument can be framed against the new views of Jewish history. An inquiry into this latter subject forms the chief part of Dr. Stanley Leathes's book, *The Law in the Prophets*. He has collected and printed in order all the passages in the prophets which appear to him to contain reminiscences of the Pentateuch. The number of these is very large. They vary greatly in character. Some are not more than verbal coincidences such as, if they stood alone, would naturally be expected in independent works. Others are ways of speech which might be common in a nation, and by themselves would show nothing as to the relative dates of documents which agree in containing them. Others are very difficult to account for on any other hypothesis than that the prophets knew and used the Law. It is when the different classes of passages are viewed together that their real force is seen, and when so regarded the impression they naturally make is that the minds of those who wrote them were imbued with the enactments and phraseology of the Pentateuch. As Dr. Stanley Leathes himself says :

'It must be understood that the coincidences here exhibited are not supposed to be all of equal weight ; they will not strike all readers with equal force, and some few will not probably be rejected as of no value whatever. But my object has been, as far as possible, to collect *all* the cases of apparent similarity, in order to make the list complete. It is more than probable I have still overlooked some, if not many ; but I think that the ordinary reader of the English Bible, for whom I have written, will not fail to be struck by the mass of evidence here presented. If that evidence is reduced by twenty per cent., the remainder is more than sufficient for my purpose ; for the strength of my position, that the Law was known to the prophets, lies in the cumulative character of the evidence exhibited' (preface, pp. ix, x).

We are inclined to share the opinion the writer anticipates will be held by some, that in his desire for completeness he somewhat overstates his case, but, when this is allowed for, the impression we have mentioned still remains. And it is to be noticed that in many cases the force of the coincidence is greatly strengthened by the consideration of the Hebrew words ; that the references are to all parts of the Pentateuch, including the so-called 'Priestly Code ;' and that the parallels in Malachi, in whose time it is admitted the Law existed, are less striking than those in Hosea, who wrote at a much earlier date.

Our thanks are due to Dr. Stanley Leathes for the careful collection of passages from the prophets to which we have referred, as also for useful lists of passages from the New Testament, which illustrate our Lord's appeal to Scripture and His supernatural knowledge. But the value of the book is not confined to these parts

of it. There is much important matter on the witness of other books of the Bible to the Pentateuch and on the bearing of the teaching of our Lord upon the subject, which applies the arguments derived from the compilations which we have mentioned.

There is a useful appendix on the Pentateuch which formerly appeared as a series of papers in the *Guardian*. It deals briefly with some of the chief arguments commonly used for the purpose of attacking the Mosaic character of the Pentateuch, and contains passages of weight. We think the following important:

'It is not a little remarkable, and it is certainly germane to the general subject, that for eighteen centuries the Jews have shown sufficient tenacity to continue the observance of their national rites—such, for instance, as the Passover, the Feast of Tabernacles, and the Day of Atonement, and that under every possible disadvantage; but, upon this theory, they had not only not observed them for the fourteen centuries before Christ, but had completely remodelled their national customs and constitutions five centuries before the Christian Era, and had forgotten that they had done so. It would seem that their national character must have changed entirely from what it was before Christ came. That is to say, from what we know of the extraordinary tenacity of the Jewish race as a fact for eighteen centuries, it is far more consistent with probability that they should for fourteen centuries have observed the customs delivered them by Moses than that, contrary to all the evidence of their historical literature, they should have entirely remodelled those customs in the time of Ezra and retained them unchanged for the eighteen centuries since their dispersion' (p. 305).

'Is it more likely that the advocates of a theory should be carried beyond the limits of discretion by their theory, or that the belief and tradition of a nation should be mistaken in such a matter as the existence of the tabernacle? Is it more likely that the ark of the covenant, of which we know nothing after the Exile, should have had an imaginary ritual invented for it by priests in Babylon, or that the original history and ritual of the ark should have survived that catastrophe in the memory of the nation? . . . Is it more likely that the story of the rebellion of Korah should have been invented, with all its features of verisimilitude and graphic touches of reality, to raise the *status* of the priests who were willing to return from Babylon, than that that story should have descended from remote antiquity, being alluded to in the Psalms? In short, before we can accept the most modern theories as to the composition of the Pentateuch, we must not only believe that the history of the nation was developed upon entirely different principles, but that God's government of and dealings with His people were conducted in ways totally different from those which are presented to us in the books themselves' (pp. 307, 308).

We have expressed elsewhere our opinion that a great task lies before Christian students of the Old Testament at the present time. If we are not able to follow Dr. Stanley Leathes in quite all the details of his latest book, we welcome it as a piece of careful work on the lines which will, we think, lead to important and true results, and we hope it is but the forerunner of a more elaborate treatise on the meaning and history of the Law.

The Divine Library of the Old Testament. Its Origin, Preservation, Inspiration, and Permanent Value. Five lectures by A. F. KIRKPATRICK, B.D., Regius Professor of Hebrew in the University of Cambridge, and Canon of Ely Cathedral. (London and New York: Macmillan and Co., 1891.)

FOUR of the lectures which this book contains were delivered at Whitsuntide, 1891, in the Cathedral of St. Asaph, to clergy and laity of that diocese; that which is placed third was given at Ely in 1885. There is thus a special interest connected with their original purpose besides that created by the lectures themselves, and we notice Professor Kirkpatrick expresses his

'sincere admiration for the way in which the Dean and Chapter of St. Asaph, by gathering the often isolated and much-tried clergy of a scattered diocese for a short period of social reunion and theological instruction, are making the Cathedral a real centre for the diocese' (preface, p. xii).

The first two lectures are on the 'Origin of the Old Testament.' They contain clear statements on the method in which some of the Old Testament books appear to have been compiled. It is shown how the writers of the historical books incorporated earlier materials, and in their use of them, as a general rule, left the language of the original accounts untouched. This explains the vividness and detail of much in these books:

'The primary authorities for large parts of the history in the books of Samuel and Kings were the narratives of contemporary prophets. Samuel may have been the historian of his own lifetime, which included the greater part of Saul's reign. Nathan and Gad together may have recorded the history of David's reign. The full and vivid account of David's friendship with Jonathan may possibly be preserved almost in the very words in which David told his story to his friends the prophets; and the singularly graphic and detailed narrative of David's flight from Jerusalem reads like the description by an eye-witness of the events of a memorable day, of which every incident was indelibly stamped upon his memory' (p. 14).

A similar method of composition by the process of compilation is illustrated from the prophecies of Jeremiah and Isaiah, the Proverbs and the Psalms. Professor Kirkpatrick, we observe, adopts the opinions that the later chapters in the book of Isaiah are not rightly ascribed to that prophet, and that some of the Psalms which the titles assign to David are by a different author. An example of the method in which the form of prophecies may have been modified when collected into a book is found in an incident in the history of Jeremiah:

'This narrative' (*i.e.* in Jeremiah xxxvi.) 'throws important light upon a prophet's mode of working. There was a long period of oral teaching, during which he committed nothing to writing; and obviously it can only have been a condensed summary of that teaching which was embodied in the roll. Doubtless it represented faithfully the sum and substance of the message which he had been commissioned to deliver; but it can

hardly have repeated the *ipsissima verba* of discourses spread over a period of more than twenty years' (p. 18).

The 'Hexateuch' is regarded as a compilation of a somewhat different kind, containing four principal documents: the 'foundation document' or 'Priest's Code,' the Elohist and Jehovistic histories which were combined at an early date into the 'prophetical narrative,' and Deuteronomy (pp. 44, 45). The 'compilation of the Hexateuch from pre-existing sources' is stated to be 'one of the certain results of critical inquiry' (p. 46). Professor Kirkpatrick does not express his opinion as to the relative age of the 'Priestly Code' and Deuteronomy, or the date of the final composition of the work, but he says 'there are elements in the Hexateuch of vast antiquity, coming down from the twilight ages of the childhood of the world before the call of Abraham' (p. 48), and quotes words of Dr. Delitzsch that there is a 'possibility that the narrative rests on tradition, and the codified law springs from Mosaic roots,' and that in the 'testamentary discourses' of Deuteronomy there is 'a traditional substratum, which the free reproduction follows,' and that 'the author of Deuteronomy has completely appropriated the thoughts and language of Moses, and from a genuine oneness of mind with him reproduces them in the highest intensity of Divine inspiration' (pp. 46, 47).

The third lecture is a clear and useful account of the history and condition of the text of the Old Testament.

The fourth lecture is on the 'Inspiration of the Old Testament.' Here it is said 'the *fact* of inspiration is an essential article of the Christian faith, the *nature* of inspiration is left to be inferred from the Scriptures themselves' (p. 87), some of the old and new difficulties in believing in Inspiration are mentioned, two extreme views are condemned:

'A purely mechanical theory has practically ignored any real activity on the part of the human instrument; or an entirely subjective theory has virtually denied the reality of the Divine communication of truth which could not otherwise have been known. The proposition that "Scripture *is* the word of God" has been hardened into the dogma of the verbal inspiration and absolute inerrancy of every word of the Bible, and the Jewish theory of the dictation of the Pentateuch to Moses has been extended to the rest of the Old Testament; or, on the other hand, the proposition that "Scripture *contains* the word of God" has been volatilized till all distinction between Scripture and other books is obliterated, and the inspiration of Moses or Isaiah is held to be not materially different from the inspiration of Solon or Aeschylus' (p. 91).

The 'consideration of the inspiration of the Old Testament' is regarded as best 'approached by a general consideration of the Divine purpose of which it is the record' (p. 93), that is, by observing how the history and institutions of the Jewish nation furnish the preparation for the coming of Christ. From this point of view Professor Kirkpatrick selects certain 'positive and negative' 'characteristic

¹ Delitzsch, *New Commentary on Genesis*, vol. i. pp. 28, 35 (English translation).

features' of the inspired books (p. 97). They take 'primitive traditions of the human race' and purify them and 'mould' them 'into a new shape and for' the 'definite purpose' of teaching religious truth, so that they 'convey their lessons in a form which is intelligible to the least educated race and to the youngest child, and yet will never cease to grow in meaning for the most cultured race and the wisest sage' (pp. 97-9). Inspiration, it is said, is not lessened 'if the Mosaic law was Mosaic in germ only and not in its complete development,' and if 'the legislation which is connected in its completed form with the delivery of its original elements during the forty years' wandering in the wilderness' was 'the outcome of centuries of national life' (p. 99). The historical books, in their silence and in their statements, 'bear the marks of Divine superintendence' because 'they interpret the course of Israel's history in its relation to the history of Redemption' (p. 100). The Inspiration of the prophets is seen in their 'sublime views of God,' the 'lofty ideas of His righteousness, His loving-kindness, His faithfulness, His holiness,' the 'inflexible convictions of His corresponding demands on men,' the 'deepening spiritual conceptions of the meaning of sacrifice,' the 'inextinguishable certainty in days of evil rule that a Divine kingdom of truth and righteousness must ultimately be established,' the 'undaunted proclamation' 'that a new covenant should be made and written in the heart of every Israelite,' the 'unhesitating prediction' 'that Israel should yet fulfil his mission to the world' (pp. 100, 101). The Divine guidance in the Psalms is described in the words of Dean Church¹ as being shown in the 'piercing, lightning-like gleams of strange spiritual truth,' the 'magnificent outlooks over the kingdom of God,' the 'raptures at His presence and His glory,' the 'wonderful disclosures of self-knowledge,' the 'pure outpourings of the love of God' (pp. 101, 102). With such positive characteristics, Inspiration, it is said, is seen to possess also those that are negative. It does not exempt from the need of using existing material and of research, or from the adoption of current literary methods of the time and place. It does not guarantee entire accuracy 'in matters of science or fact or history' (p. 105). It 'does not exclude imperfection and relativity and accommodation' (p. 106). There is a 'double proof of the inspiration of the Old Testament' in 'the essential unity which characterizes it,' and in 'the response of the soul to its message' (p. 109).

The last lecture deals with the 'use of the Old Testament in the Christian Church.' The Evangelists and Apostles and our Lord Himself, both by statements and by the use made of the Old Testament, show that they 'regarded it as having a permanent value and authority for the Christian Church, and as containing a depth and fullness of meaning, which could only be understood gradually in the light of the consummation of Christ's life and work' (pp. 114, 115). If past misuse and the vague suspicions due to some forms of criticism have joined with the 'feeling' 'that the New Testament

¹ Church, *Discipline of the Christian Character*, p. 57.

'demands our first and most careful attention' (p. 119) in leading to the Old Testament being neglected in the present day, there is need of recalling the way in which it was regarded by our Lord and His Apostles, and the uses the study of it may have for the Church. 'There is the historic use. The Old Testament is the historic foundation of Christianity, the record of the long, patient, manifold preparation for the Incarnation' (p. 123). There is the 'indispensable' aid which 'the study of the Old Testament' supplies 'for the right interpretation of the New Testament' (p. 126). There is the practical value of the Old Testament in its teaching on national and social questions, and its personal and devotional use.

There are three notes at the end of the volume, on the 'Critical Study of the Old Testament,' 'The Date of the Psalms,' and 'Allegory and Myth.' The second contains a useful remark:

'Though it is true . . . that "the dark places of history must sometimes be illumined by the torch of conjecture," it cannot be too carefully remembered that that torch is not daylight, and is extremely apt to cast misleading shadows' (p. 148).

We have read Professor Kirkpatrick's book with great interest. It contains much which is valuable; the method of teaching is clear; the moral and spiritual tone is high. Yet we cannot unreservedly praise it either in its critical conclusions¹ or in its theological principles. There seems to be a forgetfulness, which, if it was not so common, would be strange, of the real bearing of the teaching of our Lord and the New Testament writers on the criticism of the Old Testament. It is stated in the preface that in examining what Inspiration means 'facts must be carefully ascertained and co-ordinated' (p. viii), and in the fourth lecture that 'we must go to the record itself, and endeavour to learn from it in what ways and by what methods and under what conditions God was pleased to preserve the record of His dealings with Israel and His words spoken to Israel' (pp. 96, 97). Certainly, this is true, but it does not seem to be remembered that among the facts which must be considered the words of Christ and the New Testament writers are not the least important. There is an illustration of this on page 104. It is there said that we have no right to assert that the Old Testament cannot contain myths. Whether that is or is not true *à priori* is a question which does not now concern us, but we desire to point out that in considering the true interpretation of the parts of Genesis which are sometimes regarded as mythical, the teaching of our Lord² and of St. Paul³

¹ *E.g.* the apparent acceptance of theories about the Pentateuch (pp. 42-47, 99, 100), part of what is said about Isaiah (pp. 26-31), and the view that the early chapters of Genesis are due not to the selection of what is true from what is untrue, but to the purification of mere legend (pp. 97, 98). Still it is satisfactory to read: 'I cannot but think that it is an extreme and passing phase of criticism which would deny the existence of Davidic Psalms entirely, and relegate all the Psalms, with perhaps one or two exceptions, to the post-exilic or even the Maccabæan age' (p. 41).

² St. Matt. xxiv. 37; St. Luke xvii. 26.

³ Rom. v. 12-21; 1 Ep. to Tim. ii. 13, 14.

must b
and ph
quite
Kirkp
of criti
may so
critics
which
truth e
mere u
conver
when
author
teachi
said th
among
ment,
what i
not H
the In
It
on the
by som
favour
wholly

'N
Resurr
great r
the pr
scious
waveri
place i
to othe
and fir
fast wi
divinel
revelat
a who
silentl
the au
pp. vii

Alres
la
C

THER
this vo
chapto

1 S
2 S
3 S

must be borne in mind. It is one thing to say that particular words and phrases may be interpreted by different methods of exegesis, and quite another thing to describe a narrative as a myth. Professor Kirkpatrick speaks in one place of the 'probable conclusions' (p. 8) of criticism and in others (pp. 17, 25) of 'practical certainties.' It may sometimes happen that against the probability asserted by some critics there must be set not only arguments from critical investigation which point in a different direction, but also the absolute certainty of truth enunciated by our Lord. We are not prepared to say that the mere use of a name by our Lord would of necessity be more than a convenient way of referring to a book generally known by that title, but when our Lord argues on a particular basis,¹ or refers to a particular authority,² or uses a circumstance as a warning,³ we think His teaching ratifies the authorship or legislation or fact. And if it be said that in His human mind He was ignorant of some matters, among which might be critical questions relating to the Old Testament, it must be pointed out that, whether this is true or untrue, what is required if His authority on these points is to be set aside is not His ignorance but His mistake. And the Catholic doctrine of the Incarnation makes it certain that He could not err.

It has been painful to us in reading much we highly appreciate on the value of the Old Testament to think how sadly it is undermined by some critical theories which the writer appears to regard with favour, but we would end our notice with a passage with which we wholly agree:—

'No devout Christian who believes the facts of the Incarnation and Resurrection can possibly regard Christianity as merely one among the great religions of the world; or view the religion of Israel, which formed the preparation for it, as merely a natural development out of the consciousness of a naturally religious people. He must hold fast without wavering to the conviction that Christianity occupies a wholly unique place in the history of religions; that it is not merely somewhat superior to other religions, but differs from them in kind, as being God's supreme and final revelation of Himself to mankind in His Son. He must hold fast with equal tenacity to the conviction that the history of Israel was a divinely ordered history, and the religion of Israel a divinely given revelation, leading up to the coming of Christ, and preparing for it in a wholly different way from the negative preparation which went on silently in the heathen world. This belief we accept as Christians on the authority of our Lord and the Apostles whom He taught' (preface, pp. vii, viii).

Alresford Essays for the Times. By Rev. W. O. NEWNHAM, M.A., late Rector of Alresford. (London and New York: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1891.)

THERE are three chief subjects upon which the different essays in this volume bear—the meaning and historical character of the early chapters of Genesis, Miracles, and some eschatological questions. It

¹ St. Matt. xxii. 41-45; St. Mark xii. 35-37; St. Luke xx. 41-44.

² St. Matt. xix. 8; St. Mark x. 3.

³ St. Matt. xxiv. 37; St. Luke xvii. 26, 32.

is one of the many attempts which have of late been made to present parts of the Christian faith in a light which may remove some of the difficulties which have been felt about them. The writer is one of those who thinks that 'the nineteenth century requires a resetting of the jewels of the Catholic faith,' while he hopes 'it will be seen that anything which' he is 'willing to give up is only antiquated setting' (preface, p. viii).

The essays upon Genesis vigorously condemn the current theories of some schools of criticism and regard the early chapters as true history. The account of Creation is gone through in detail with the intention of showing that an exact interpretation of the language used proves the history to be in entire accordance with the conclusions of modern scientific research. This correspondence is used as an indication that the history must have been revealed by God, since in no other way could the requisite knowledge have been obtained at so early a date. Further conclusions are that if God could thus reveal truth once, it is reasonable that He should make revelations at other times, and that the Bible must be regarded as different from any other book, since its beginning is thus God's own work.

Mr. Newnham interprets the first chapter of Genesis as containing an account of the formation of the world and man out of matter previously created and in a condition resulting from intense volcanic activity. This work of formation is represented, he thinks, as occupying six great epochs, and the opening verses of the second chapter of Genesis describe the beginning of the seventh epoch, which is still in existence. The remainder of the second chapter is not, according to his interpretation, another account of the same events, but a history of subsequent facts. Before these facts a pre-Adamite race of men had existed. From them 'a single male specimen of humanity' and 'a single female of his blood stock' were 'chosen' and 'transplanted to a tract of country far removed from the ways and influences of the autochthons,' and given a law which 'they failed to keep,' and were therefore 'driven out from all the conditions of ease which belonged to Eden, to rear up the higher race in an atmosphere of sin, sorrow, sickness, and death' (p. 186). The existence of the pre-Adamite race is thought to be shown by the

¹ Mr. Newnham translates Gen. ii. 7, 'And God took into covenant man who is mere dust from the ground' (p. 194), and ii. 21, 'And God took one of his female relatives, and purified the fleshly appetites under her power' (p. 220). This translation of אָחִי מִצִּלְעָתִי is defended by the parallel of רֵבֶכֶה, which is said to mean 'side' in Ps. cxxxix. 3; Ezek. i. 8, and (in the plural) 'progeny' in Ex. xx. 5; and of the use of 'latus' in later Latin to mean 'kindred.' We do not think there is ground for saying that the meaning of רֵבֶכֶה in Ex. xx. 5 is derived from the use of רֵבֶכֶה for side. And we question whether an argument with regard to לָטֵר can rightly be founded on the meaning of 'latus' to which reference is made. Nor are we prepared to accept the other distinctive features in the translations here quoted. We must not be understood as affirming Mr. Newnham's opinion about רֵבֶכֶה in Ps. cxxxix. 3.

inter
sixth
epoch
where
finde
ing o
'dau
destr
any o
amon
land
secur
part

A
'sett
defin
the r
cogni
no c
ordin
will,
powe
hum
so' (l

'J
and n
have
line o
of ope

Mirac
Lord
to Hi
to be
Tyan
instan
'large
in 'th
been

'M
natur
But b
of na
that t
the v
(pp. 1

T
said,
memb
becau

interpretation which regards the creation of man as taking place in the sixth epoch and the forming of Adam as belonging to the seventh epoch, by the fear of Cain when he 'is driven out of the tract of land where his father and mother are living' (p. 202), that 'whosoever findeth' him 'shall slay' him, by the marriage of Cain and his building of a city, and by the later incident of the 'sons of God' and the 'daughters of men.' The Deluge was a literal flood, limited in extent, destroying all the race of Seth except the family of Noah, not harming any of the pre-Adamites except 'such as had entangled themselves among the sons of Seth' (p. 254), and caused by a subsidence of land which would allow the incursion of the waters of the sea, and secure, while it lasted, the continued presence of the flood on the part of the earth which was submerged.

A miracle is said to be wrongly defined as 'a suspension' or 'setting aside of some of the laws of nature' (p. 141), and the definition is given that it 'is an event produced by a force which is the resultant of some ordinary forces of nature of which we can take cognisance, and of some extraordinary ones of which as yet we have no certain knowledge' (p. 155). It is added that these 'extraordinary forces' 'appear to be generally set in action by the human will,' that 'humanity possesses latent in it mighty and unsuspected powers,' and that 'a miracle consists in the exercise of this mere human power by one of a very small band of *élite* who are able to do so' (p. 156). Consistently with these assertions, it is stated that

'Jesus of Nazareth worked miracles in virtue of His perfect humanity, and not in virtue of His Godhead; and that therefore when we shall have attained a perfection in humanity like unto His in our own special line of development, we shall each one of us, in his own allotted sphere of operation, be entrusted with the like powers' (p. 157).

Miracles, therefore, are naturally to be expected in the work of our Lord because of the perfection of His humanity, and those ascribed to Him are shown to have really happened by evidence which is not to be found for legendary miracles such as those of Apollonius of Tyana. It is likely that miracles happen at the present time, as, for instance, in the 'so-called Roman Catholic miracles' (p. 165), in the 'large residuum of unaccountable marvel left' when the 'trickery' in 'the marvels worked by every professor of electro-biology' has been allowed for, and in 'the marvels of Indian jugglers' (p. 166).

'Miracles must be uncommon, else, like the regular wonders of nature, by their commonness they would cease to be regarded as miracles. But because they are uncommon, and different to the ordinary operations of nature with which we are acquainted, we have no right to assume that they may not have been contemplated, and provided for, even in the very order which was at first stamped upon the world by God' (pp. 174, 175).

The remaining essays are eschatological. There is nothing, it is said, to prevent 'a clergyman of the Church of England' and 'a member of the Church Catholic' from holding Universalist opinions, because of the result of the suit of Williams *v.* the Bishop of Salis-

bury and the absence of a 'consensus of Catholic antiquity' 'against this teaching' (pp. 45, 46). The real meaning of *αἰώνιος* is 'eternal,' not 'everlasting,' that is, it is 'descriptive of *quality*,' not 'of *quantity*' (p. 58); 'eternal life denotes the very life of God,' and it is not 'duration' which constitutes 'the overwhelming glory of this life' (p. 59). No part of Holy Scripture asserts that the punishment of the wicked is everlasting. Some passages show that all men will at last be saved, and the truth of the omnipotence of God requires that no created will should remain for ever alienated from Him. We cannot positively declare that the devil will be restored, since we do not know whether Christ died for him as well as for us, but it is more likely than not that he will be. There is no real loss to practical religion in the abandonment of the opinion of everlasting punishment, which as a check is valueless. On the other hand, the gains are great. It is possible to give a better answer to many difficult questions, there is an expanded sense of the power and wisdom of God, there will be less sorrow for dead friends whose lives have not been good, and 'a weight of undone and misdone ministerial duty will be taken from off' the 'shoulders' of the clergy, who, if 'confronted by souls who can say, "You did not do your duty by me," will be able to 'say, I have put more work on Jesus than He need have had, but He will save whom I would have lost' (pp. 93, 94). The body of the Resurrection will be simply the 'forces, faculties, and affections' (p. 291) of the body of this life.

In his statement of the losses and gains which would result from the abandonment of the belief in everlasting punishment, we think Mr. Newnham refutes himself. If such an abandonment will allow the clergy to think rightly as he describes, and to solace themselves for faulty ministrations by the thought that, after all, these do not matter so much as has been supposed, a most wholesome sense of the solemnity of their life and work will certainly be lessened, and anything which reduces the feeling of ministerial responsibility is a loss. The tendency of a belief that in every case all is certain to come right in the end must be to destroy, however gradually, a serious way of regarding life which is a real influence for good. And we do not agree that, speaking generally, the check is valueless. Fear is not the highest reason for right action, but it has its place as a moral agent, and as such it was appealed to by our Lord. And we would recommend any who think Mr. Newnham establishes his case as to the teaching of Holy Scripture and the absence of a 'consensus of Catholic antiquity' to read and thoroughly consider Dr. Pusey's sermon on everlasting punishment,¹ and his later work on the same subject.² And while we agree that it is easy to be too materialistic in our opinions about the Resurrection, and to dogmatise unduly

¹ Pusey: *University Sermons*, vol. iii. pp. 3-35.

² Pusey: *What is of Faith as to everlasting punishment?* There is a valuable statement which bears on a good deal in Mr. Newnham's treatment of this subject in Dale: *Lectures on the Epistle to the Ephesians*, pp. 92-94.

where
can r
ident
and t

T
factor
in wh
marve
parall
work
deduc
of th
Etern
in vie
the n
call tw
God's

'M
of som
interes
beginn
that it
act of
except

'It
thing
what v
and cu
are ca
nature
who an
Himse

No th
direct
fact th
univers

We
of Ger
histori
the lat
the tru

¹ I
² I
³ L
⁴ S

incong
novimu
nobis c
magnal
legem,
nullo m

VOL

where little has been revealed,¹ we do not think that any statement can rightly be accepted which fails to recognise both the essential identity of the body of the future life with that which we now possess, and the altered condition in which it will be.²

The discussion on miracles has struck us as singularly unsatisfactory. We think not a few readers will be shocked at the passage in which the very objectionable practice of Hypnotism and 'the marvels of Indian jugglers' are counted as, to a certain extent, parallel to the miracles of Christ. The statement that our Lord worked His miracles 'in virtue of His perfect humanity' and the deductions drawn from it have surely been written in forgetfulness of the truth that in the Incarnate life the Divine Person of the Eternal Son of God acted in the works done in the Manhood. And in view of what seem to us partly true and partly mistaken ideas of the nature of miracle expressed in this book, we think it well to recall two clear statements of great value on the relation of miracle to God's ordinary laws:

'Miracle is an innovation upon physical law—or at least a suspension of some lower physical law by the intervention of a higher one—in the interests of moral law . . . The Eternal Being sees the end in the beginning; He sees the exception together with the rule so simultaneously that it is untrue to say that He anticipates it. It is a simple, indivisible act of will, whereby He everlastingly wills the rule together with the exception—the exception with the rule.'³

'It is not unfitting for us to say that God does contrary to nature anything which He does contrary to that which we know in nature. For what we thus call nature is that order of nature which is known to us and customary, and when God does anything contrary to this, His actions are called miracles or wonders. But contrary to that supreme law of nature which is outside the knowledge alike of the wicked and of those who are still weak, God is as far from acting as He is from acting against Himself.'⁴

No theory of miracles will be satisfactory which does not assert the direct action of the personal God superseding ordinary law, and the fact that such interventions are foreseen in the Divine plan of the universe.

We have much sympathy with Mr. Newnham's essays on the book of Genesis. We believe that patient study will in the end show the historical character of the real meaning of the earlier, as well as the later, portions of the book. It is of very great importance that the true significance of each word and phrase should be weighed.

¹ 1 St. John iii. 2, *ὅτι αὐτὸς ἐφανερώθη τὶ ἰσχύμεθα*.

² 1 Cor. xv. 36-38, 42-44; Phil. iii. 21.

³ Liddon: *Elements of Religion*, pp. 73, 74.

⁴ St. Augustine, *c. Faustum*, xxvi. 3. 'Sed contra naturam non incongrue dicimus aliquid Deum facere, quod facit contra id quod novimus in natura. Hanc enim etiam appellamus naturam, cognitum nobis cursum solitumque naturæ, contra quem Deus cum aliquid facit, magnalia vel mirabilia nominantur. Contra illam vero summam naturæ legem, a notitia remotam, sive impiorum, sive adhuc infirmorum tam Deus nullo modo facit, quam contra se ipsum non facit.'

And while we are not able to follow him in all details of scholarship and of other kinds,¹ we recognise much in what he says which calls for careful consideration. But we are inclined to think that he aims at clearer solutions of difficult passages than it is at present possible to obtain.

Our last criticism leads us to a central fault, as we think, in these very interesting essays. The author appears to us to be in too great a hurry to get rid of anything which is hard to understand and to explain everything so as to be perfectly plain, and thus to be led to formulate theories which fuller consideration will scarcely justify. It is indeed a high task to be trying to commend the Faith to the educated thought of the day, but it is a task which, perhaps beyond all others, demands patient waiting for full solutions and a very strong grasp on the sacredness of revealed truth, and it is too commonly forgotten 'that a hasty simplifying is apt to lead to a worse complication than ever.'²

Reason and Authority in Religion. By J. MACBRIDE STERRETT, D.D., Professor of Ethics and Apologetics in Seabury Divinity School. (London and Sydney: Griffith, Farran, Okeden, and Welsh, n. d.)

THE second part of this book deals chiefly with two works which we have already reviewed,³ *Lux Mundi* and Dr. Martineau's *Seat of Authority in Religion*. The first part of it contains Dr. Sterrett's development of his own position on subjects which the title suggests.

One of the points which most forcibly struck us on our first reading of *Lux Mundi* was the extent to which the writers were indebted to the late Professor Green, and the influence evidently exercised on their minds by the Hegelian philosophy generally. This side of the book naturally has an attraction for Dr. Sterrett as a student of Hegel, and he devotes a good deal of space to showing the resemblances in thought and method between the German philosopher and the Oxford essayists. In the 'spirit and method of studying and appreciating Christian history and institutions' (p. 119), in the 'conception of revelation' (p. 173), in the representation of 'the rationale and extent of authority in the Church' (p. 127), these resemblances are pointed out. And the historical connection is noticed with some of its results:

'The influence of Oxford Hegelianism in these essays is very marked. The late Thomas Hill Green profoundly influenced many of the brightest men at Oxford, leading them to a study of Hegel. But very many thus influenced have been carried by Hegel's thought and their own environ-

¹ We think it especially difficult to see how the account of the relation of Adam to other men is to be reconciled with the sin of Adam affecting the whole race and with the whole being redeemed by Christ: see Rom. v. 12-21; 1 Cor. xv. 22.

² Bright: *Fidelity and Sympathy united in True Teachers*, p. 7.

³ See *Church Quarterly Review*, April 1890, 'Theology and Criticism'; October 1890, short notice of *Lux Mundi*, tenth edition; January 1891, 'Authority in Religion.'

ment
saying
Anglo-
transfo
the con

'Re
in *Lux*
that is
the tru
rational
and the

We
between
Hegel,
stripped
writers
tendenc
due to
suppose
following

'The
Christian
It is clea
merely
Church

Yet we
which h
fuse the
the natu
existenc

Dr.
Mundi,

'We
Catholic
preters o
forefront
extinction

In two s

'One
It is too
branches
"Hinter
and Angl
whole ric
of history
them to r
Church, i

¹ See
1850, p. 2

ment into the Anglo-Catholic party. This has given rise to a current saying in England, that all the honey from Green's bees goes into the Anglo-Catholic hive. But this honey has had the vital power to transform the hive. It is another case of the conquered giving laws to the conquerors (pp. 115, 116).

'Reason is the only interpreter' (that is, according to the writers in *Lux Mundi*) . . . It is not each single man's reason or conscience that is ultimate; nor is it the voice of the Church that alone proclaims the truth. It is the reason of the individual, informed, enlightened, rationalized by the corporate reason of mankind recorded in the Bible and the Church' (pp. 112, 113).

We do not think Dr. Sterrett sufficiently recognizes the differences between the opinions expressed in *Lux Mundi* and the theories of Hegel, or adequately allows for the regard for revealed truth, when stripped of what they consider to be accidental, which the English writers possess; possibly some of their lines of thought which his tendency would be to ascribe to a more modern source are really due to the influences of Alexandrian Christianity; and we do not suppose they would accept as accurately stating their position the following words:

'They hold the same as Hegel, who says, "It is important that the Christian religion be not limited to the literal words of Christ Himself. It is clear that the Christian community produces *the Faith*. It is not merely the mechanical sum of Christ's words, but the product of the Church enlightened by the Spirit"' (pp. 158, 159).

Yet we feel that the influence here indicated is one among many which have led these able and earnest writers in some places to confuse the distinction between the objective and the subjective, and the natural and the supernatural, and sometimes to forget the real existence of differences in kind as well as degree.¹

Dr. Sterrett greets with enthusiasm the main principles of *Lux Mundi*, as he himself interprets the book:

'We bid these new leaders of this movement all hail. If the so-called Catholic party in our Church will follow these new leaders and interpreters of "*The Faith*," they may become truly Catholic, and be in the forefront of the Church militant. If not, the party is doomed to the extinction which all isolation and lack of intelligence involves' (p. 184).

In two separate points he raises objections:

'One criticism must be offered as to their conception of the Church. It is too insular to be quite catholic. . . . Outside of the episcopal branches of the Church there are also other vital and fruitful branches. "Hinter dem Berge sind auch Leute." Outside of the Greek, Roman, and Anglican communions there are also Christian communions. The whole rich fruitful Christian life of modern Europe and America is a part of history. Their historico-philosophical method would seem to compel them to recognize and synthesize all this in their genial conception of the Church, in order to make it Catholic, as well as in order to maintain their

¹ See *Church Quarterly Review*, April 1890, pp. 213-218; and October 1890, p. 221.

Hegelian philosophy of history . . . Not only the Dissenters in England but Kirkmen in Scotland, State-Churchmen in Germany, Sweden, and other countries, are ruled out of the Saviour's one flock, and the validity of their ministry and sacraments denied. They really base their apologetic for the Catholic Church upon its social religious power for good. Yet these other national churches are as efficient forms of instituted Christianity and as valid powers for promoting the extension of the Incarnation as the Church of England. They manifest the same historical vindication as the Church of Rome or the Church of England, as set forth by these writers. They are simply false to their spirit and method, in failing to integrate these forms as real organic members of the Catholic Church' (pp. 178-180).

We think this passage faulty, not only as, in its main principles, opposed to the teaching of Catholic Christianity, but also as a criticism of *Lux Mundi*. The want of adequate realization of the writers' attitude towards revealed truth, which we have already mentioned, has prevented Dr. Sterrett from seeing that there are principles which they accept which require the fulfilment of certain external conditions if valid Sacraments are to be obtained. And from this it follows that the full privileges of Church membership cannot be received except in an episcopal communion.¹ At the same time we do not think the criticism altogether groundless. As we have said, in our opinion there is a failure in some parts of *Lux Mundi* to maintain the true distinction between the natural and the supernatural. This failure exists in the writers side by side with an acceptance of revealed truth where they are clear it is revealed truth which necessitates the Catholic doctrine of the Church and the Sacraments. But our fear about *Lux Mundi* all along has been that this particular failure would, if worked out by others, lead in the end to the rejection of Christianity altogether as a dogmatic system, since it takes away the ground upon which we are able to assert that in the revealed Faith there is certain, objective truth. Dr. Sterrett's criticism is imperfect as paying too little attention to the side of *Lux Mundi* which is referred to on pages 120, 121 of his book; it has foundation as marking what would naturally result from a particular feature of the writers' position.

The second criticism is this :

'Another criticism, too, may be offered as to their conception of the so-called "Catholic heritage," which their party is labouring so zealously to restore. . . . Knowing them to be leaders of that party which has sought a restoration of all sorts of ecclesiastical rubbish, we feel tempted to read between the lines of the text and make them *participes criminis*. This revival of "Catholic customs" by a party *ne plus ultra* Protestant dissenters is an incoming flood in our Church that needs to be met with some hesitating criticism. Much of it is unintellectual and unethical romanticism. All that can be done to really adorn the Bride of Christ, all the beauty of worship that is genuinely artistic and not tawdry ornament, is to be welcomed. But let this "be done decently and in order" by the Church, and not by the self-assumed infallibility of Protestant priests. Let it, too, be done apart from the desire to magnify the sacer-

¹ See *Lux Mundi*, pp. 372-386, 415-433.

dotal function of the presbyter above his ethical function as a leader and inspirer of men' (pp. 182, 183).

We think it is a strange idea of the character of the American Church which leads Dr. Sterrett to describe one party in it as '*ne plus ultra* Protestant dissenters,' and for our own part we cannot doubt there are necessary inferences from central truth which call for Catholic customs and, in their proper place, ritual observances which he appears somewhat strongly to dislike.

In our review of the *Seat of Authority in Religion*, while we regarded the first book of that work as containing much which is admirable, we gave some of our reasons for thinking that 'Dr. Martineau's opinions will fail to supply a form of belief which will be an effectual and permanent moral power,'¹ and for condemning them as likely to lead to 'disastrous' results;² and we tried to show their uncritical and unhistorical character. Dr. Sterrett's conclusions, on this subject, are very much the same as our own. There is a high appreciation of the first book:

'It is scarcely just to pass over the first part of Dr. Martineau's volume without generous praise and extended quotation. It is a continuously profound, subtle, and convincing argument for the existence and presence of God, as opposed to all materialistic and agnostic theories' (p. 132).

There is a strong condemnation of most of the rest of the work:

'We must turn from the part that will win praise and thanks from all good Christians to that larger part which will startle, pain, shame, and anger nearly all who profess and call themselves Christians' (p. 134).

'We have read *his* biography and gazed upon *his* portrait of our Lord with mingled pain and astonishment and resentment' (p. 146).

'His conception' (*i.e.* 'of the Church and its history') 'is so purely subjective that it has no place outside of himself, no consistency with any large historical process or institution. Even the Christ concealed by history cannot be seen, he confesses, without some distorting subjective conceptions of his own. Thus his own, as well as the corporate conceptions of the Church, hide what he would gladly find and use as an interpreter of his own immediate apprehension of God. His is the neo-Platonic effort at *ecstasy* which logically leads, as it has always historically led, to despair' (p. 161).

Our interest in Dr. Sterrett's criticisms on what he calls 'the two great books in the English religious world this year' (p. 109) has led us on, and we must write shortly on his statement of his own position. Religion is defined to be 'the reciprocal relation or communion of God and man' (p. 31). It has an 'objective side' (p. 33), 'revelation,' and a 'subjective side' (p. 34), 'faith.' 'Revelation' is made 'through our knowledge of nature, through our knowledge and love of our brethren'; it has as '*media*' 'signs and tokens and mighty works, Bible and Church, family and social life' (p. 33). 'Faith' is 'God's children's cry of Abba, Father . . . their apprehension of their divine sonship, the responsive thrill of emotion awakened by

¹ *Church Quarterly Review*, January 1891, p. 282.

² *Ibid.* p. 314.

the consciousness of God's paternal relation to them' (p. 35), and 'is grounded upon and mediated for us through institutional Christianity' (p. 36). In religion there is an 'ultimate ground,' 'the eternal and loving reason of the First Principle of all things' (p. 39). Of religion there is a history :

'It begins as an immediate, indefinite apprehension of the fact in the subjective consciousness, but it expands and wins definite content with the growth of human consciousness in all spheres of experience. Thus subjective religion expands with new revelation and apprehension of it into objective forms of creed, cult, and institution, which in turn educate and strengthen it. The same spontaneous consciousness of "the Power not ourselves" that led the childhood of the race to personify earth and sky, also led Plato and Clement and Hegel, through the mediation of Greek and Christian culture, to proclaim the essential and perennial kinship of man with God, in all the concrete experience of his life and institutions' (pp. 41, 42).

The history of religion shows the results which have been reached. The individual believes because the community has believed. The community has given to us 'the heritage of' 'the ecumenical creeds, though enough open questions still remain to make us heroes of faith, and our generation an age of faith' (pp. 44, 45). Behind the history is the 'metaphysical *Urgrund*,' God (p. 46).

The rest of this part of the book is occupied with some notes on the 'psychological forms through which religion passes in racial and individual experience,' that is, on religion as '*feeling*,' as '*knowing*' in its three phases of *conception*, *reflection*, and *comprehension*, and as '*willing*' (p. 49). Throughout there is much which is interesting on the processes of religious thought. There is useful emphasis on the facts that religion on its human side is the act of the whole man reaching out to his Divine Father, and that faith is the realisation in act and will of man's right relation to God. We miss anything like a true sense of an objectively revealed faith which can make an imperative claim, the recognition of which, under proper conditions, affords the test whether man's subjective faith is working rightly. We notice the want of a true conception of the Church to show the limits of the complete guidance of the Holy Spirit in corporate teaching. The 'communal Christian consciousness' (p. 104), to which Dr. Sterrett makes his appeal as the 'ground of authority,' is, as he interprets it, too wide and vague to be really helpful. The permanent judgment of the whole Church is indeed to be regarded as protected by the guidance of God, but in so regarding it we must remember that the true idea of the Church implies such conformity to the Divine plan as requires the retention of episcopal government and powers. The acceptance of revealed truth indeed continually grows more rational as the harmony of the different parts with one another and with different branches of truth is understood, but Dr. Sterrett's opinions, if we rightly interpret them, would make the truth itself too dependent on its realization in human thought.

There are a few misprints which call for correction, and a mistake on page 112. Mr. Gore is the Principal, not of 'Keble College,' as there stated, but of Pusey House.

IN re
the v
make

"viol
slow
discr
woul
" ?
all po
less t

He t
on so
critic
fallib
Gore
But t
have
Lord
is by
David
"assu
Lord
"viol
think
that a
our L
histor
Psalm
Jonah
teache
which
consis
impor
shoul
is this
are ne
traditi
He di

¹ Se
preface
² Se
³ Se
⁴ Se
⁵ Se
⁶ Se

Mr. Gore's Essay in Lux Mundi considered. By RICHARD C. OULTON, M.A., Rector of Glynn, co. Antrim. (London: Skeffington and Son, 1891.)

IN reviewing this pamphlet we wish to say at the outset that we think the writer on one point misapprehends Mr. Gore's position. He makes the following statements:

'Mr. Gore speaks of the assumption of our Lord's infallibility as "violating the whole principle of His Incarnation by anticipating the slow development of natural knowledge"' (p. 32).

'When the Head of the Pusey House would set us to the task of discriminating between the relative authority of our Lord's sayings, he would impose upon us an impossibility' (pp. 37, 38).

'The merest suggestion that our Lord is not infallible and decisive on all points of His teaching fills me with a horror which words are powerless to express' (pp. 40, 41).

He thus appears to regard Mr. Gore's view as being that our Lord on some matters was infallible, and on other matters, including critical questions with regard to the Old Testament, was not infallible. This would be the natural interpretation of part of Mr. Gore's essay as it stood in the first three editions of *Lux Mundi*. But the later editions of *Lux Mundi*¹ and the *Bampton Lectures*² have shown his meaning to be that, while every assertion which our Lord made is of necessity true, He did not assert that the Pentateuch is by Moses, or that Jonah was swallowed by the great fish, or that David wrote the one hundred and tenth Psalm. And it is not the 'assumption of our Lord's infallibility' but the opinion that our Lord taught at all on critical questions which Mr. Gore regards as 'violating the whole principle of the Incarnation.'³ We ourselves think the position in important respects untenable. We consider that a just interpretation of the Gospels requires us to believe that our Lord assumed the Mosaic character of details in the Law,⁴ the historical reality of the story of Jonah,⁵ the Davidic authorship of Psalm cx.,⁶ in such a way that if the details were not Mosaic, or Jonah not historical, or Psalm cx. not by David, He would be a teacher of error. We are consequently of opinion that critical theories which Mr. Gore is prepared to accept would ultimately prove to be inconsistent with the truth of Christ's infallibility. But it is of the greatest importance that the exact position of each writer on this question should be kept clear, and Mr. Gore's own view, as we understand it, is this: Christ is an infallible teacher; all His assertions, therefore, are necessarily true; in the cases in question, if He had asserted the traditional beliefs, those beliefs would be binding upon Christians; He did not do this, but used current phraseology, or referred to an

¹ See *Lux Mundi*, pp. 359, 360 in fourth and subsequent editions; preface to tenth edition, pp. xxxii, xxxiii.

² See Gore, *Bampton Lectures*, pp. 153, 154, 192-199.

³ See *Lux Mundi*, p. 360, and preface to tenth edition, p. xxxiv.

⁴ St. Matt. xix. 8; St. Mark x. 3; St. John vii. 19, 22, 23.

⁵ St. Matt. xii. 41; St. Luke xi. 32.

⁶ St. Matt. xxii. 41-5; St. Mark xii. 35-7; St. Luke xx. 41-4.

allegory, or asked questions on the assumptions of those whom He addressed, there being in no case positive teaching.

It is partly because of our sympathy with Mr. Oulton's general position and our regret that he should weaken his case by what we cannot but think a misconception that we have dwelt upon the point to which we have referred. For the greater part of the pamphlet appears to us to contain considerations which are of value. Even on the modified forms of particular theories of Old Testament criticism, which Mr. Gore's essay allows to be compatible with Christian belief, it is difficult to understand our Lord's teaching about Himself as the Messiah. It is not the least of the grave objections which exist to those theories that they tend towards destroying what is, in our opinion, the true view of the Old Testament as a preparation for Christ. And it is a serious reason for questioning them that they fail to satisfy the demands of that harmonious way of regarding Scripture as a whole which has been characteristic of Christian teachers. And we are disposed to agree with Mr. Oulton that the large extent of ignorance which has of late been ascribed to the human mind of our Lord would be a difficulty in the way of regarding Him as a perfect teacher, and might even endanger, in the case of one occupying the position He claimed to fill, His perfect morality.

Mr. Oulton's pamphlet deals with the question at issue in a somewhat different way from most of the criticisms on *Lux Mundi* which have been published, and it should be read by those who are studying the subject. In saying this, we shall not be understood to indicate our approval of every statement in it, and we wish to express our regret at the author's suggestion (p. 48) of the possibility of a divided authorship of Psalm cx.

Paganism and Christianity. By J. A. FARRER. (London and Edinburgh: Adam and Charles Black, 1891.)

THIS singular volume professes to be an attempt to present the case between Paganism and Christianity as any great classical writer of the ancient world might do, if he could now speak for himself and 'had at his command eighteen centuries of church history and all the writings of the Fathers and theologians.' What use the resuscitated classic would make of so portentous an equipment is not very clear, inasmuch as Mr. Farrer, who assumes the position of advocate for him, quotes little beyond the literature of the fourth century, and of that mainly from Pagan writers. He is persuaded, however, that he has made a great discovery. Pagan literature and philosophy, he asserts, represent a civilization to which we still owe *the main and better elements* of our own. A false impression is designedly conveyed of classical literature, 'by that ever-encroaching sacerdotalism of our time which is hostile to free inquiry into Church history, or to a free use of the human reason in matters of doctrine.' Terrible as is this condition of things, it is not without its alleviations. There are yet those, Mr. Farrer assures us, 'who hold aloof from that vortex, and look with the complacency of a

landsmen on the toilers of the sea, upon the frivolities of theological controversy, and upon the anathemas of the sects' (p. vii). The next paragraph, however, plunges us once more into despair :

'It has long been a matter of general admission that from the very infancy of the Church questions of dogma and discipline came to be of paramount importance, whilst purity of life and action fell into a secondary position. . . . Consequently, the history of the Church *became and remained* the history of its extreme and more illiterate section ; and though in the turbid stream there always flowed a thin streak of the truer Christianity, and of the spirit of its Founder, the gentler and more rational votaries of the new religion were too weak or too few to affect either its colour or its character ; they either kept in the background, or became outcasts and heretics' (p. viii).

These extracts from the opening pages of the Introduction may suffice to indicate the tone of Mr. Farrer's book. He professes unbounded scorn of orthodoxy and confidence equally unbounded in the triumph of reason. But the grounds of his confidence are far to seek, since he alleges that purer ideas gave way before bad reasoning, that rational conclusions succumbed to narrow notions, and that a bigot achieved an easy victory over his intellectual superior in the case of Cyril and Nestorius.

These sweeping conclusions, ushered in by the author in the Introduction, are supported by a series of chapters which treat of Pagan monotheism, theology, religion, superstition, and morality, in which it is maintained, with lengthened quotations from Seneca and other writers, that neither in theory nor practice has the world gained by the substitution of Catholicism for Paganism. Extravagant as is such a position, it is tricked out in such a guise as might easily deceive the unwary. Words the same in sound, but absolutely different in sense, when used by Pagan and Christian writers, are quoted as identical in both cases in meaning and extent. Pagan ethics, in themselves hardly distinguishable from Christian morals, are elaborately described, whilst the lack of power to practise what was preached is studiously ignored or calmly denied. Sweeping assertions are based upon inadequate premises. To the conception of the unity of God nothing was added by Christianity (p. 2). The Christian theory of angels *differed in no degree whatever* from the Pagan theory of gods or demons (p. 23). In love and thankfulness to God, for His goodness, in trustful resignation to His providence and will, in a moral and spiritual endeavour to bring human life into conformity with His perfections, the Pagan world had no lesson to learn of the Christian missionaries (p. 63).

In reply to these sweeping dicta, it may suffice to remind the reader that Bishop Lightfoot has exhaustively dealt with most of the points here touched upon in his striking essay upon St. Paul and Seneca, with a wealth of learning and a nicety of discrimination to which Mr. Farrer presents no parallel. As Christians and Catholics we have no jealousy of the wonderful light vouchsafed to those whom Mr. Farrer quotes—those seekers after God and truth whose spiritual insight was such that they have been claimed as Christians

by many of the Fathers. Nor are we careful to defend all the errors of the great men whom Mr. Farrer bespatters so plentifully. But it is a singular instance of judicial blindness which leads a man, in the name of 'healthy reason and common sense,' to write a book so steeped in prejudice, misrepresentation, and groundless hatred to Catholic theology as this work over which we have already dwelt at greater length than it deserves.

Reasons for the Hope that is in us. Brief Essays on Christian Evidences. By the Ven. ARTHUR E. MOULE, B.D., Archdeacon in Mid-China, &c.; Author of *Songs of Heaven and Home*, *Story of Chek Kiang Mission*, &c. (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1891.)

AMIDST the multitude of works that is issuing from the press on the subject of Christian Evidences, there is yet ample room for Archdeacon Moule's excellent little volume. His book does not profess to occupy such ground as that taken by elaborate and learned apologists, and in handling the deep problems involved in the question of the Resurrection and of a future life, some of the essays are a little thin and fragmentary; still, such short studies on great subjects have a considerable value. There is enough in Archdeacon Moule's *Reasons* to help the faith of those who are prepared to receive them, and to lead those on to further investigation who wish for a fuller grasp of the grounds of the Christian position.

Any publication appearing at the present time which involves, as this book does, an appeal to the testimony of our Blessed Lord, must necessarily handle the question of His authority as well as that of the Old Testament, and on this point Archdeacon Moule not only accepts the orthodox belief, but gives weighty reasons for cleaving to it. He unhesitatingly adopts Lord Hatherley's conclusion that 'the two Testaments must stand or fall together; and that if the Old Testament Scriptures be devoid in any part of truth, our Lord's testimony to them must be untruthful, and then the moral world is a chaos and the Christian's hope a dream.' He utters a few pungent remarks upon the theory of 'limitation' and self *κένωσις* advocated in *Lux Mundi*, which he rightly considers, although carefully guarded and explained, to differ but little in principle from that of Bishop Colenso. And he urges with force, but with a brevity that we would gladly have seen substituted by more exhaustive treatment, that from His Baptism the Christ is said to have been 'full of the Holy Ghost,' and to have returned from His Temptation in the power of the Spirit; whilst he further quotes from St. John iii. 34 words which appear to be at once so crucial and conclusive ('He giveth not the Spirit *by measure*') as to entirely refute the notion that anything but the very truth of God fell at any time from the Saviour's lips.

In starting from the fact of the Resurrection, the cardinal truth on which Christianity hinges, Archdeacon Moule throws out some pungent suggestions in reply to Agnostic cavils. The rise and spread of Christianity needs to be accounted for, and the cause must surely

be worthy of the effect. Is the current suspicion of the supernatural, which we are assured is spreading, more suitable to the actual condition of man than the anxiety which a deep thinker¹ tells us every seriously-minded man feels to take hold, if he may, of a Divine hand stretched out to help him in the storm and sunshine of this unintelligible life? Is it really truer to say, with Mr. Herbert Spencer, 'the more thought advances the less do we know of God,' than it is to affirm that the advance of thought and the growth of science, from which it springs, are both parts of a progressive revelation of God? Is it more rational or more logical to accept the assertion of Agnosticism that 'God is unknowable'—a dictum which in its very terms is self-contradictory—than it is to believe that 'humanity is not wandering orphaned through a fatherless world,' and that the universal conviction of the human spirit in the existence of God has not been an inexplicable will-o'-the-wisp designed to plunge its deluded pursuer in a quagmire of bottomless uncertainty? Such are some of the questions which Archdeacon Moule suggests, although not in the terms in which we have stated them. It is not, perhaps, a special defect in these *Reasons* that they pass over the enigma of evil and consequent suffering in somewhat cursory fashion. There will ever be insoluble difficulties so long as 'we only know in part.'

The section of Archdeacon Moule's book which is devoted to 'the Bible' contains much that will be both new and helpful to many younger readers. Some points of supposed variance between Scripture and science are shown to have been reconcilable, and with fuller knowledge we may confidently believe that other difficulties will vanish. It is perhaps needless to say that the *Reasons* altogether repudiate the conclusions of the higher criticism, and accept our Lord's evidence on questions of the authorship of the several books of the Old Testament as decisive. That His Divine testimony was unqualified by any traditional dread of what was currently accepted is sufficiently seen in the independence of His moral teaching, and in His denunciation of Pharisaic hypocrisy. In the third section, which treats of a Future Life, the usual arguments are urged in favour of the independent existence of the spirit, and of the consequent probability of its survival after the destruction of the body. 'I am what I am,' urged Mozley, 'and this is my argument for my immortality.' This probability, supported as it is by a variety of other reasons, makes the voice of revelation upon resurrection, judgment, and immortality antecedently credible.

It is not a little singular that in combating the assertion that the heaven of the Bible is vague or unattractive, Archdeacon Moule makes the common mistake of quoting 1 Cor. ii. 9 ('Eye hath not seen, &c.'), and stopping there, without adding the following verse, which asserts that, though unknown to man apart from revelation, 'Unto us God revealed them by His Spirit.' Yet he does proceed to work out in some detail what is taught us of the eternal rest. On

¹ Mr. Hutton, quoted on p. 31.

such deep questions as are here discussed exhaustive treatment is, of course, impossible within the space of the Archdeacon's pages; but his little book contains much thoughtful matter, and may confidently be commended for a large class of general readers.

Problems of Christianity and Scepticism. Lessons from Twenty Years' Experience in the Field of Christian Evidence. By the Rev. ALEX. J. HARRISON, B.D., Vicar of Lightcliffe, Evidential Missioner of the Church Parochial Mission Society, Lecturer of the Christian Evidence Society. (London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1891.)

THIS very interesting volume is not a formal treatise, but, as its title implies, is a condensed record of twenty years' experience as a controversialist in the field of Christian evidence. How wide and varied his experience has been may be estimated when we state that in addition to the narrative of his own personal journey from scepticism to faith, recorded in terms which recall St. Augustine's Confessions, Mr. Harrison presents us with the substance of addresses delivered to such contrasted audiences as meet at the Hall of Science, the headquarters of the Freethinkers, and at the Church Congress. Amongst other marks of signal fitness for so responsible a post as that of an evidential apologist, in a day when its requirements are exceptionally *exigant*, Mr. Harrison possesses considerable knowledge of scientific principles which he handles with much logical acumen, genuine sympathy with honest doubt which does not degenerate into weak concession of Christian verities, an entire conviction of the solidity of the Christian faith which disdains any unfairness, however slight, in its defence, and a burning desire to win men to Christ which detects and claims for Him any element of good, even amongst His bitterest opponents.

The plan of the volume is somewhat novel. Book the first—entitled 'To Christians and Sceptics'—is mainly addressed to believers, and contains a very lucid diagnosis of the different shades of scepticism, and many thoughtful suggestions on the treatment which they severally require. The different lines of argument are mapped out, and their distinctive force is indicated with much power and precision. Very specially and admirably does Mr. Harrison insist upon the object and temper which are essential to the true success of the Christian controversialist. His object, to win men to Christ. His temper, one of untiring love. 'To fail in an argument is to manifest a weakness love will forgive; to fail in love itself is, in the blindness of our fighting passion, to blunder over to the enemy's side' (p. 52). Book the second—'To Sceptics and Christians'—contains in its first chapter a singularly clear and concise statement of 'the sceptic's case,' which the writer then proceeds to answer point by point. Mr. Harrison's absolute fairness is transparent in this, the most valuable part, to our minds, of his book. The case of the sceptic is stated with a fulness that leaves no point out of the account. He is not for an instant disposed to shun obscurities and hold a farthing candle to the sun.

Whether or no the reader may adopt all his explanations, or agree to some of his admissions, there can be no question, we think, about the genuine honesty with which he puts himself into the sceptic's place, and gives all just weight to every difficulty by which the sceptic alleges that he is beset. The detailed answer is relieved and interspersed with some amusing incidents and observations of personal experience, from which those whose office calls them to take a personal part in the discussion of such 'problems' may gather many useful hints.

The following quotation may serve as an illustration of Mr. Harrison's style:—

"There is one great scientific fact to which I must call your attention. I wonder whether any of you ever asked yourselves how many forces and laws of nature are concerned in the constitution of the earth, of a plant, or an animal? If you studied that matter, I fancy you would be astonished at the number and complexity of the forces and laws in operation. There is a sort of vague notion, common enough, that science teaches that law is absolute and will not be controlled. But, in fact, science teaches nothing of the kind. You certainly cannot defy law; but, paradoxical as it may sound, if you obey it, it will obey you. The physiologist will tell you that in the human body there are examples of the three kinds of lever, and that thus the mechanical powers are employed to modify and control the force of gravitation. The physicist will tell you how, in the movement of the earth round the sun, the so-called centripetal and centrifugal forces so modify each other that the earth does not absolutely obey either, but takes continually the line which results from their joint action; and he will find you numberless examples of the same principle in all the phenomena of motion. The chemist will tell you that in the case of gases cohesion is overcome by their natural tendency to expand, and expansion by their natural tendency to unite into more or less stable compounds. But I need not increase instances, for it is the plain teaching of science that we have no example of any one force or law operating by itself; but that all forces and laws are found in combination with other forces and laws, producing infinitely varied, manifold, and complex results.

"Now, it appears to me that it is just here that natural theology finds its chief strength. The adjustment and adaptation of forces and laws so as to produce given results certainly point to intelligence and purpose; and where you find intelligence and purpose, I think you may be satisfied that you are in the presence of a personal God. Of course a great deal depends upon what is intended by the word "personal." I will explain how the word is used by me. I go into no question of the origin of the elementary substances of which the universe is composed; of the distinction between material and immaterial substances; of the free or not-free action of the will. These questions are profoundly interesting and supremely important, but they are not necessary to my object. What appears to me the essential element in personality is will—volition. How much greater than "personal" God may be, I, of course, cannot tell; but I am sure He is not less. Mr. Herbert Spencer remarks that the choice is not between personality and something lower, but between personality and something higher; and if anyone can show me that "something higher," I will gladly accept it. Meanwhile I use the word "personal" as the highest approximation to the truth of which I am at present capable. And I maintain that

the universe overflows with evidence of purpose, of the adjustment and adaptation of forces and laws to the fulfilment of purpose, and that where you have adaptation and adjustment to the fulfilment of purpose, you have evidences of intelligence and will, in other words, of "a personal God." . . . The greatest thinker of this age in the sphere of scientific philosophy is Mr. Herbert Spencer; and, as far as I am acquainted with his works, I know nothing of his that could invalidate my argument. He would probably say that the terms of my description are insufficient, which I willingly grant; but then I simply use the highest and noblest words I can to indicate Him for the expression of Whose glory no language is sufficient' (pp. 240-42).

We had marked for quotation a number of the pithy, clean-cut sentences which are scattered throughout Mr. Harrison's pages. There are few more trustworthy indications of careful thought than this power of terse expression; but we forbear. Enough has been said to express our high appreciation of the ability with which problems of Christianity and scepticism are handled by Mr. Harrison. One pervading thought is traceable through the entire volume. The author is not unmindful of the special privilege of belonging to the Divine Society which our Blessed Lord came to establish on earth, and he speaks most gratefully of his own cordial welcome into the Anglican Branch of the Church Catholic; but his one foremost object in the controversy in which most of his life has been spent is not his own victory, but that of truth; and his 'conscious aim is not so much to uphold a body of doctrine as to bring souls into saving union with the Redeemer of the world.

Blanche, Lady Falaise: a Tale. By J. H. SHORTHOUSE, Author of *John Inglesant, Sir Percival, Countess Eve, &c.* (London: Macmillan and Co., 1891.)

ALL thoughtful readers of English fiction look with intense interest upon a new work by the author of *John Inglesant*. There are certain qualities which are sure to be embodied in any creation of his brain. Pure and lofty purpose; a refined delicacy of touch; considerable clearness of insight into character and no little strength in its delineation; a mystic bent of mind that loves to hover on the borders of the spiritual world and would fain uplift the veil which parts the material from the unseen; a sacramental bias that sees ever in the visible only the symbol and the sequence of which the invisible is the true substance and the sustenance—such are the special elements which Mr. Shorthouse combines upon a psychological study when he betakes himself to the composition of a new tale. And in *Blanche, Lady Falaise*, we have a striking resultant of these forces. The story is told with all its author's characteristic finish—with perhaps excessive exuberance of descriptive power in word landscape and portrayal of scenery, and with that vivid grasp of salient and distinctive traits that is so efficient to invest the characters of a story with bright and living interest. And the characters in *Blanche, Lady Falaise*, do stand out splendidly on the canvas. The beautiful Blanche, with her lofty ideals of utter self-sacrifice, of which she has never tasted one particle,

to be exercised in dark slums, to which she is an entire stranger. The dear old-world, well-born, well-read rector, Blanche's father, with his courtly grace and his chirpy anecdotes, and his well-written sermons on the Moral Virtues, and his true loving instincts lying deep down beneath a somewhat pompous exterior and a rather self-indulgent life. The young Lord Falaise, Premier Viscount of England, heir not only of broad acres and large investments, but of the accumulated responsibility derived from all the best traditions of a noble lineage to be unapproachable in honour, and in that estimate of self which makes no effort too great for one in his position: and all this with the utmost simplicity of manner. A little blasé, perhaps, since those who can have everything rarely care much for anything. And the Rev. Paul Damerle, the great mission preacher—a man of intense intellectual receptiveness and of strained ideals, whose whole powers of mind and body were centered in his work and his mission, 'his Master's service,' as he boldly said, but not without a lurking idea that the Master's service was centered in and hinged upon Paul Damerle. How Blanche declines Lord Falaise's advances, regarding him, with his well-bred optimism, as little better than a boy. How she accepts Damerle with that absolute surrender which Tennyson so strikingly depicts,

'till at the last she set herself to man
As perfect music unto noble words,
Yoked to all exercise of noble end.'

How Damerle eventually abandons the noble, but portionless, girl for a rich heiress—the gradual development of so much of the story and its effect upon Dr. Botereaux, brings the first part of the tale to a close. The second part opens with the marriage of Blanche, whose father never recovered the shock of his daughter's desertion by Damerle, to Lord Falaise. His tenderness and devotion are unremitting, and Blanche has every outward thing a woman can desire—rank, wealth, a peerless husband, two beautiful boys—but Damerle's fall has unhinged her mind. She persists in blaming herself for his sin, and her misery is increased when she learns that he is ruined and disgraced. In the hope that she may benefit by foreign travel, the Falaises go to South Austria, but her miserable depression and despair increase upon her, and she is only (apparently) saved from self-destruction by perishing in a thunderstorm at the foot of a Calvary to which she has wandered alone, and where she lay, 'one small black spot upon her shoulder, where the lightning had struck her.'

It is a beautiful conception which brings a life so lofty and so full of sorrow to its end beneath the sacred emblem which testifies that defeat and disaster, however seemingly perfect and complete, had not really gained the final victory. And the lesson is yet further enforced in a vision seen at the moment of Blanche's death by Lady Elizabeth Damerle. Before the altar, in the unspeakable light, she sees Lady Falaise, and as she gazes these words rang in her ears: 'Thou hast tried to offer a sacrifice which it was not for thee to offer, and to bear a punishment which was not thine to suffer or to bear.'

Nevertheless, the sacrifice which thou hadst to offer is accepted, and the punishment which was thine thou hast fully borne. Thy prayer is heard. His sins, which are many, are forgiven him. He is turned, and shall be saved' (pp. 286, 287).

The interest of so simple a story of course depends upon its details, and it is in these that Mr. Shorthouse's genius is specially manifest. The book abounds in exquisite passages, as well as in those pregnant sentences, which indicate how deeply its author has meditated the problems of sin and its consequences, with which his tale is concerned. We would gladly have quoted the beautiful scene in which Dr. Botereaux declares from the pulpit his own forgiveness of the man who has so deeply injured him. We should have liked to give other extracts, but they would surpass our limits, and we confine ourselves to the record of our own verdict upon the story. It seems a little ungracious to find fault with a tale so touching and beautiful, but we feel persuaded that Mr. Shorthouse has missed the mark in *Blanche*, *Lady Falaise*. In any work of creative imagination, whether embodied in sculpture or painting, in poetry or prose romance, the one thing needful is truth, and this essentially depends upon due sense of proportion; and it is just here that the work before us fails. That the true path of service lies in the conscientious fulfilment of home duties, and not in dreaming over distant ideals; that the study of such self-communing melancholy, as abounds in Amel's *Journal Intime*, will inevitably engender morbid feelings; that the shattering of an idol proved unworthy may produce a lasting bitterness and self-reproach—all these points may be fully and frankly allowed; but their ultimate effect upon a character mellowed through their painful discipline is to be traced in the subdued beauty and tenderness which are among the ripest of Christian graces, not in the heart which hardens itself until it becomes dead to the affection alike of husband and of children. Blanche Botereaux, a beautiful motherless girl, with only lofty and noble aims, with exceptional tenacity of purpose, has despite some failings which a mother's love might have checked, all the elements for the making of a grand character. She loves not wisely, but too well, and nothing can divert her mind from mourning over the man who has abandoned her. Not the persistent, unwearied love for twelve long years of the most chivalrous husband pen ever portrayed. Not the ineradicable maternal instinct for the two beautiful boys with which her union is blessed. Not the recollection that she had so sadly misjudged her father. Not the faithful and candid remonstrances of the friend who knows all the story of her sorrow. The pursuing vengeance of an avenging fury is concentrated in her to a degree that amounts to veritable madness, and so exceptional an instance of a diseased mind does not afford a valid illustration of the providentially designed working of sin. We feel as we go on that the punishment is in excess of the crime. Our sense of justice and our reason revolt against the persistency in a self-tormenting monomania which wrecks the happiness of such a man as Falaise as well as herself. It would not, in our judgment, be conceivable as unfolding the working even of the *igneæ lex in dextra Domini* quoted

as the
ful lea
the sha
may be
things

The In
D
E
ed
18

It is a
reache
'Faith'
note o
one wh
after th
touchin
convey
additio
Human
said, '
for suc
were it
advers
incarna
served
'incom
(1) inv
will of
fere wi
of the
receivi
asked
with re
human
length
numbe
more t
Bright
the mo
whole

'W
dom of
Scriptu
knowle
without
as Teac

It
a testin
VO

as the motto of the story. And, if it were, it would not be the truthful lesson for us who live, not under the thunders of Sinai, but beneath the shadow of Calvary. For we are not come to the mountain that may be touched, but to the Blood of sprinkling, which speaketh better things than that of Abel.

The Incarnation as a Motive Power. Sermons by WILLIAM BRIGHT, D.D., Canon of Christ Church, Oxford, Regius Professor of Ecclesiastical History, Honorary Canon of Cumbrae. Second edition. (London and New York: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1891.)

It is a great pleasure to us to see that these admirable sermons have reached a second edition. The new matter consists of a sermon on 'Faith's Resource under Trial,' and an addition, a page long, to the note on 'the "exinanition" and the Atonement.' The sermon is the one which was preached by Dr. Bright in Christ Church Cathedral after the death of Dr. Liddon. It is of great beauty and power, touching alike in a keen sense of human trials, in the impression it conveys of personal loss, and in an indomitable faith in God. The addition to the note is made as a 'safeguard against Nestorian or Humanitarian tendencies.' Christ's assumption of humanity, it is said, 'did not involve any surrender of the character of Godhead; for such surrender would have been (1) impossible, (2) needless, were it possible, for the purposes of His condescension, (3) directly adverse to those purposes.' There were indeed 'limitations' in His incarnate life, and consequently there was a surrender of the 'unreserved exercise of Divine prerogatives' which would have been 'incompatible' with these, but such 'limitations' 'could neither (1) involve His human will in the possibility of a revolt from the will of the Father, which was one with His Divine will, nor (2) interfere with the full discharge of His function as the Prophet and Light of the world.' Dr. Bright regards our Lord's 'human mind' as receiving 'real accessions of knowledge,' some of the questions asked during His Ministry as seeking 'information,' and His words with reference to His second coming as showing that 'He did not humanly "know" the appointed time.' We have dealt at some length with each of these three points elsewhere in the present number, and it is therefore unnecessary that we should here do more than call attention to the resolute strength with which Dr. Bright joins his way of regarding our Lord's human knowledge with the most entire loyalty to His teaching, as is shown throughout the whole passage and emphatically asserted in the closing sentence:—

'Whatever He explicitly or implicitly *taught*, whether as to the kingdom of God, or the will of the Father, or His own unique claims, or the Scriptures which testified of Him, must have been the expression of a knowledge which flooded His mind with Divine light; He could not, without self-contradiction, have been either peccable as Man or fallible as Teacher.'

It is strangely appropriate that this new edition should contain a testimony to Dr. Liddon's greatness, and a vindication of a truth

VOL. XXXIII.—NO. LXVI.

M M

so dear to Dr. Liddon's heart as the infallible character of our Lord's explicit or implicit teaching about the Old Testament.

The Authorship of the 110th Psalm. A Sermon preached before the University in the Church of St. Mary the Virgin, Oxford, on Sunday morning, December 6, 1891, by the Rev. E. H. GIFFORD, D.D., late Archdeacon of London, and Canon of St. Paul's. Published by request. (Oxford and London : James Parker and Co., n.d.)

THIS is a very valuable sermon on the authorship of the 110th Psalm. This Psalm, Dr. Gifford points out, 'claims the highest degree of Divine inspiration' 'as the "voice" or "oracle of Jehovah" to my lord' (p. 4); it describes 'the Psalmist's "lord" or king, seated at God's right hand, the promise of victory over every enemy, the power sent forth from Zion, the self-devotion of the saintly host, the irrevocable oath of Jehovah, the vision of the new Melchizedek, the warfare in which the Lord God of Hosts stands as an invisible power at the king's right hand, the wide battlefield strewn with the dead, the victor himself hard be-sted and fainting by the way, yet lifting up his head in triumph at the last' (p. 6); it closely resembles the second Psalm, and was probably written at the same time and place and by the same author. The place was evidently Jerusalem. It is contrary to 'literary taste and historical judgment' to suppose that the writer was Alexander Jannæus, a 'debauched and blood-thirsty tyrant' (p. 8). The 'historical position' of 'Simon, the successor of his brothers, Judas Maccabæus and Jonathan' (p. 8), does not correspond to the indications of the king who is described in the Psalm. Internal evidence suggests that it was written in the time of David, by David himself, and on the occasion of the bringing up of the Ark to Jerusalem.

The authorship of this Psalm is of peculiar importance because of the reference to it by our Lord.² A great service is done to the Christian Faith when reasons are given from the critical standpoint for accepting the author who is assigned to it by the title and in the words of Christ. The most cordial thanks of Churchmen are due to Dr. Gifford for his useful statement of evidence which bears upon this point.

1. *Passiontide Sermons.* By H. P. LIDDON, D.D., D.C.L., LL.D. late Canon and Chancellor of St. Paul's. (London and New York : Longmans, Green, and Co., 1891.)
2. *Sermons on Old Testament Subjects.* By H. P. LIDDON, D.D., D.C.L., LL.D., late Canon and Chancellor of St. Paul's. (London and New York : Longmans, Green, and Co., 1891.)

It was natural that at the time of Dr. Liddon's death churchmen should consider what were some of the reasons of the interest and power of his preaching. And it probably seemed to most who really

¹ Ps. cx. i.

² St. Mat. xxii. 41-5; St. Mark xii. 35-7; St. Luke xx. 41-4.

thought about the matter that the strongest influence of all was the personal character which underlay the Sermons. The splendid intellectual gifts, the trained and systematic mind, the beautiful voice, the mixture of delicate humour and yearning pathos could exert their force, because it was felt that the truth he taught was the centre of his own life, and that on moral questions he had a right to speak. It is sometimes surprising to notice how readily teaching, which would not naturally be welcome, will be received when it is recognized that the teacher is true to his own words, and has himself embraced the hardest lessons he impresses upon others.

The two volumes of Sermons which Dr. Liddon's literary executors have published since his death contain abundant illustrations of the main characteristics of his preaching. Perhaps their most striking features, after the moral force we have spoken of, are the preacher's unswerving allegiance to the truths contained in the teaching of the Bible and the Church, as necessitated by the claims of God, and the intensely practical application of these truths to the needs of modern life.

(1) The *Passiontide Sermons* will hardly fail to help many who suffer to bear their burden better and with a fuller sense of the meaning of the self-sacrifice of Christ. There is an invigorating power in such passages as these :

'If any one of the laws by which the moral world is governed is certain, this is certain : that to do real good in life is, sooner or later, costly and painful to the doer. It has ever been so. All the great truths which have illuminated human thought ; all the lofty examples which have inspired and invigorated human effort—all have been more or less dearly paid for by moral, or mental, or physical suffering. Each truth has had its martyr, unseen, it may be, and unsuspected, yet known to God. . . . Everywhere in the great passages of human history we are on the track of sacrifice ; and sacrifice, meet it where we may, is a moral power of incalculable force' (pp. 104, 105).

'All the moral glories of self-renouncement in its higher and more splendid forms ; all the noble ambitions to do great works for God, and to be misunderstood or undervalued or forgotten in doing them ; all these passive virtues which really subdue the world, and which have their fruit in humility, show that the corn of wheat which fell into the ground and died eighteen centuries ago has not died in vain' (p. 109).

'If any one of us has to put up with coldness and aversion, for which he knows there is no real reason, he may think of and unite himself in spirit to our Lord Jesus Christ ; praying Him to bless this note of likeness to that which He Himself condescended to endure in His bitter Passion, and to vouchsafe to sanctify this light affliction by the awful mental Pain which He condescended for our sakes to endure' (p. 292).

'Think of the hundreds of thousands throughout Christendom who are lying in pain—who are drawing nearer moment by moment to their last agony—who are in the pains of death. If they can lie still ; if they have the great grace to suffer uncomplainingly, brightly ; if they irradiate the last sad scenes of our frail humanity with a radiance streaming from another world, what is the secret of their power ? It is that they have been gazing steadily on Jesus Christ Crucified ; that His patience has won them, and they have had an eye unto Him and have been lightened ; that they have said to themselves with one great sufferer, " If

M M 2

He could endure that for me, how little is this to suffer for Him!" (p. 111).

'If pain does not soften, it scars; it burns up all that remains of tenderness, and almost of humanity; it scorches each finer sensibility of the soul, and leaves it hard, fierce, brutal, beyond any previous experience' (p. 113).

Such teaching is possible because of the firm hold on the truth that everything is subordinate to spiritual union with God through Jesus Christ:

'To union with Him—with this one Perfect Life, this unfaltering obedience expressed in Death, with this accepted Head and Representative of our kind—all faith, all sacraments, all Christian instruction and Christian effort, must ever and increasingly tend; in the conviction that all sacrifices and offerings which are merely our own are worthless, but that His obedience unto Death, which we may share if we will, is the mighty earnest of our acceptance with the Father, and of our endless peace' (p. 68).

'All the agencies of restoration and grace which we find in the Church of God flow down from the wounds of the Crucified. If sacraments have power, if prayer prevails, if the Spirit is given to guide and to purify us, if consciences are clear, and hearts buoyant, and wills invigorated; if life's burdens are borne cheerfully, and death is looked forward to, not without awe, but without apprehension; this is because Jesus Christ has died' (p. 117).

The fact which underlies it is the Godhead of Jesus:

'This is the point which we Christians must never for a moment lose sight of, as year by year we traverse the history of the Sufferings which our Redeemer underwent on our behalf. The solemn truth which gives each separate event its astonishing elevation is the truth that the Sufferer is God, Who, that He might suffer, has taken a nature in which suffering becomes possible. The flesh which is scourged is the Flesh of God; the hands which are pierced are the Hands of God; the brow which is crowned with thorns, the face which is buffeted and spat upon—these are the Brow and Face of God. The Blood which flows from His Five Wounds is rightly credited with Its cleansing power; . . . as the Apostle told the presbyters of Ephesus on the beach at Miletus—it is the Blood of God' (p. 48).

The balanced loyalty with which the acceptance of Christian truths is bound up comes out in sentences like this:

'To attempt to close questions, whether of doctrine or practice, which are, and have been, at least, open for centuries, is to inflict upon the Church as fatal an injury as to open questions which Revelation has closed' (p. 16).

And the intimate bearing of religious thought upon practical life is shown in the following passage, as in many others:

'The model for Christian parents, masters, employers, governors, is rather Christ upon His Cross, in anxious pain, stretching out the arms of entreaty and compassion, than Christ upon His Throne finally dispensing the awards of judgment. . . . The love which will not take account of dulness or stupidity, not even of stubbornness and perverseness; the

lov
out i
which
on as
ness
pain,
whisp
am lo
aim a
seem
nothi
but a
out H
and g

(2)
insig
mora
Of th
sin o
powe
The
the v
need

'is in
nerve
less.
true—
silent
by we
gethe
brain
Christ
Christ

T
duties

'N
betwe
of giv
can ca
moral
inter

T
throu
some

'V
conce
if it w
shoul
men,
with t

love which anticipates the disobedience and the gainsaying, yet stretches out its hands persistently in tender and incessant invitation; the love which is not balked and chilled by one failure or by two, but which goes on as if it had not failed at all, stretching out its hands in acts of kindness and consideration; the love which gets no interest for its outlay of pain, and grief, and care, which yet shrouds its disappointment as it whispers after the Apostle, "The more abundantly I love you the less I am loved;" this is what Christians in any position of authority should aim at in dealing with those who depend on them. If all their efforts seem failures; if their exertions and their self-denials seem to bring in nothing but a fresh measure of misunderstanding and scorn; what is this but association with the Divine Sufferer on the hill of Calvary, stretching out His Hands through the long hours of His Passion to a disobedient and gainsaying people' (pp. 134, 135).

(2) The *Sermons on Old Testament Subjects* exhibit Dr. Liddon's insight into character, his power of dealing with intellectual and moral difficulties, his skill in the Christian use of the Old Testament. Of the insight into character, the sermons 'Good, but weak' on the sin of Eli, and 'Saul and David' afford striking examples. The power of dealing with difficulty is shown in 'The Blessing on Jael.' The right method of using the Old Testament appears throughout the volume. Thus, the history of Samson supplies a warning of the need of moral courage; and moral courage, we are told,—

'is independent, not merely of physical strength, but of knowledge and nerve as well; it is the courage, not seldom, of the timid and the defenceless. . . . It consists in simple loyalty to what is known to be right and true—a loyalty which acts or refrains from action, which speaks or is silent, as may be necessary. The highest forms of it have been displayed by weak women, and the strongest and bravest men have lacked it altogether. . . . What is the secret of moral courage? It is not nerve nor brain; it is a humble but vivid sense of the presence of God. In a Christian soul, loyalty to principle means a sense of the presence of Christ' (pp. 108, 109).

The weakness of Eli affords an occasion for emphasizing the duties of fathers:

'No relationship can be more charged with responsibility than that between a parent and the immortal being to whom he has been the means of giving life. Nothing that we can enact by law or change by custom can cancel, or weaken, or modify a father's duty to do his utmost for the moral as well as the material, the eternal even more than the temporal interests of his child' (p. 120).

The temptation which came to the man of God from Judah through the old prophet of Bethel serves to illustrate the bad influence sometimes exerted by the old:

'Who has not heard of young men with noble, although uninformed conceptions of duty and honour, going to ask some aged friend or relative if it were not possible to realize them, and meeting with a shrug of the shoulders and a cynical smile? . . . Who has not heard of young clergymen, impressed deeply with the seriousness and reality of their office—with the boundlessness of our Divine Redeemer's love, with the reality

of His work upon souls, by His Spirit, and in His Church, and anxious above everything to do their duty, not grudgingly but with all their hearts—going to some old incumbent whose life and work have been a gigantic failure to do spiritual good to any human being, and being told that all this activity was unnecessary and mischievous—that the old way of doing as little as you could, with as little cost to yourself as you could, was the sensible and really religious course for a clergyman; that increased Services, increased Communion, increased care for souls, increased reverence in all that touches God's service, are unnecessary, if not unspiritual, or signs of a party; that the true object is to get on quietly, with as little disturbance of accustomed routine as possible? . . . And in some cases this has been listened to, and men who might have been eminent and devoted servants of Christ have been chilled to the heart by the words of one whose experience they trusted at the very outset of their career. . . . Do I say that young men are never guilty of extravagant enthusiasms, and that old men are not bound to set them right? Far from it. But it is one thing to pour cold water on a noble and burning impulse: another to give it a right direction' (pp. 176-8).

And the healing of Naaman is an instance of the quietness with which the work of God is often done:

'Again and again, in the later ages of Christendom, vast enthusiasms have swept over Christian populations, and Elisha has come out to the door of his house, and has passed his hands over the moral sins of society, and recovered the leper. But, as a rule, the strength of Revealed Religion is seen in its power of dispensing with efforts of this kind. Its force resides, not in the earthquake, nor in the fire, but in the still small voice of conscience. The power of producing great sensations is no test of truth or goodness. The power of controlling passion and quickening conscience is such a test. But this is achieved in quietness and confidence; in the discharge of routine duties; in the formation and strengthening of quiet but deep convictions; in that inner life of affection for our Lord, which risks its excellence by rude exposure and eager demonstrativeness. An early Communion, where ten or twelve assemble in the twilight to receive the Sacrament of the Divine Redemption, is likely to be much more useful than an exciting evening sermon in a crowded church' (pp. 263, 264).

It is well the lessons should be so vigorously impressed that the recollection of the passion of Christ and union with Him may strengthen and ennoble human life, and that the Old Testament history, taken as it stands in the Bible record, is full of most fruitful thought.

The Son. By the Rev. T. MOZLEY, formerly Fellow of Oriel. (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1891.)

MR. MOZLEY is becoming a voluminous writer in his old age. He has, of course, been doing a vast amount of literary work for a great number of years; but he must have been considerably over seventy when he gave the first book of any importance with his name attached to the public, and since that time volume after volume from his pen has followed in rapid succession. His last work, *The Son*, is now before us, and we have read it with very mixed feelings. It is a wonderful *tour de force*, considering that it is the production of a man

of more than fourscore. All the vigour, the freshness, and the incisiveness which made Mr. Mozley an accomplished *littérateur* long before he appealed to the world in his own name are here to be found in an intensified form, and in many respects his new volume is a most valuable acquisition to the cause of Catholic truth. If we could just excise three or four chapters we should have nothing but the warmest commendation to express. But, if we may venture to use a homely simile, Mr. Mozley is like a skittish milch cow, which yields a good pail full of milk and then kicks it all over. A short account of his book will explain what this means.

Mr. Mozley begins with some admirable remarks on what he calls 'The Great Revolution,' meaning by that expression, not some political convulsion, but the great revolution of thought which as a plain matter of fact and history resulted from the coming of the Son. The attention of the world was turned from speculations about 'Gods many and Lords many' to the one question, 'Who was Jesus of Nazareth?' and he argues, to our mind convincingly, that a Galilean peasant, without any advantages of position or education, could never have effected this unless he had been more than man. Waiving the question of Christ's miracles, he asks most pertinently whether to have produced such a result without miracle would not have been of itself a greater miracle than any recorded in Holy Scripture. He certainly does not exaggerate the effects of this great revolution when he contends that 'in some respects at least it transcends all that man has done, and all that man can do to better his condition. It has given him a loftier and truer sense of his state, his powers, his opportunities, his infinite relations, his immortal destiny, his Divine sonship, his great human brotherhood, his relative duties, his proper dignity, his social and political rights, his privilege of access to the Almighty, and of spiritual communion with all in the same holy bond' (p. 17). Exceedingly forcible, too, are his remarks on the difficulties of Theism. 'I believe in one God,' sounds the simplest and grandest of creeds; but Mr. Mozley most rightly points out that 'as a matter of fact it never has obtained the undivided and unmixed allegiance of any people for any period of time' (p. 97); no, not even when it was stamped with all the authority of a Divine message. There has ever been an inevitable tendency to supply a missing link between divinity and humanity, and the object of Mr. Mozley is to show that that link was supplied by God Himself in the Incarnation of the Son. This he does in a clear, racy, and often very original manner. In fact, all the first part of the book is most effective, and its effectiveness is, to our mind, not lessened, but enhanced by the fact that the tone, language, and ideas are what one would expect from a clever but perfectly orthodox man of the world, in the best sense of that term, rather than from a trained theologian. The middle part of the book is rather difficult reading; the author plunges into metaphysics, and it requires a mental effort and very close attention to follow him. But 'the game is worth the candle'; the attentive reader will be rewarded for his pains by many a shrewd observation and many a thoughtful suggestion. It is

not till we come to chapter xli. that we begin to demur to Mr. Mozley's sentiments, but in that and the three following chapters they seem to us to be liable to very grave objection. The whole tone of his remarks on what he says English Churchmen love to call their 'three noble Creeds' is painful to a devout mind. The Athanasian Creed of course comes in for his severest strictures, but the strictures are out of date; they come at least a quarter of a century too late; the whole subject was thoroughly threshed out, so far as English Churchmen are concerned, in the sixties; the immense majority of all who can, by any stretch of the term, be called orthodox, were found in favour of retaining the Creed as it is, and they will not feel at all disposed to reopen the controversy. For ourselves we cannot at all enter into the force of Mr. Mozley's objections, most of which seem to arise from an easily obviated misapprehension of terms. For instance, he almost lashes himself into a fury because the 'immensus' of the original Latin is translated into the English 'incomprehensible.' Of course the word 'incomprehensible' conveys at the present day, quite a different impression from the word 'immensus,' but it really cannot be set down to the fault of the translators that they adopted a word as it was used in their own day, when 'incomprehensible' meant what its derivation would fully justify, and what would very fairly represent the Latin word 'immensus.' Mr. Mozley is good enough to allow that 'the theologians of Queen Elizabeth's time were not wholly devoid of learning or wit' (p. 271). Perhaps among those to whom he thus gives a patronizing pat on the back would be a man called Richard Hooker. If so, he will find that Richard Hooker uses the word 'incomprehensible' in precisely the same sense in which it is used in the Athanasian Creed: 'Presence everywhere is the sequel of an infinite and *incomprehensible* substance, for what can be everywhere but that which can nowhere be comprehended?' Another clause in the Creed which rouses Mr. Mozley's wrath is, 'And yet they are not three Eternals, but one Eternal.' 'Eternal what?' asks Mr. Mozley, and he implies that there was some dark design in omitting the substantive, and that the translators would have put in 'Eternal Persons' if they had dared. But the answer that any child would give, 'Eternal Beings,' is perfectly satisfactory to our mind, and we cannot see any difficulty in the matter. Then Mr. Mozley contends that 'but [there is] one God,' is an utterly inadmissible translation of 'sed unus est Deus.' Admitting for argument's sake that he is right (though we should be quite prepared to contest the point), we fail to see that it makes much difference. Let any reader substitute 'but God is one,' for 'but one God,' and ask himself seriously whether it would make any difference to his faith. In the chapter on 'the Creed of the Church of England,' Mr. Mozley seems to think, though he is rather hazy on the point, that the Church need not necessarily have any particular Creed at all, but in this chapter occurs one of his shrewd remarks which is well worth noticing. In speaking of the various religious denominations, he says, 'Of these denominations, that of utter unbelief is as offensive and defensive as any. It is an actual cult,

though running in sceptical, critical, or simply negative lines' (p. 266) Let anyone read any of the works of the apostles of their 'denomination,' and he will see how thoroughly true this remark is. *O si sic omnia!*

But in the next page Mr. Mozley airs his history in the following amazing sentences. After enunciating the truism that 'it is not absolutely incumbent on everybody to be always driving the supreme goal of human intelligence, the great mystery of the God-head,' he proceeds:

'Early last century the moving spirits of the Church of England were stirred in that direction, and it was soon found that public peace and the dynasty itself were imperilled by the rising agitation. By something like a stretch of authority the rising clamour was silenced, controversy was shelved, and the vacant ground occupied by persuasive appeals, addressed rather to the heart than to the intellect, and calculated to humble rather than flatter the pride of human reason' (p. 267).

The first part of this bit of history is, we presume, Mr. Mozley's way, and a very queer way, of describing the Bangorian controversy and the silencing of Convocation which ensued. On this we would only remark that the subject was rife before 'early last century.' Has Mr. Mozley never heard of Bishop Bull and the *Defensio Fidei Nicæna*, and of the Socinians of the seventeenth century? However, let that pass; but what on earth is the meaning of what follows? 'Controversy'—that is, obviously, controversy about the mystery of the Godhead—'shelved'! Why, the full force of it did not break out until *after* the silencing of Convocation, and it raged in one form or another during the whole of the century. Dates are stubborn things; may we present Mr. Mozley with a few? The 'controversy was shelved,' according to Mr. Mozley, in 1717. Dr. Waterland, by far the greatest writer in it, did not publish his first work till 1718, his next in 1719, his next and greatest in 1723! The Moyer Lectures at which sermons on this very controversy were delivered every year from 1719 to 1774, the writings of Dr. Priestley and the masterly replies of Dr. Horsley, still on the same controversy, which date from 1782 to the end of the century, and Jones of Nayland and a host of minor writers were ever keeping the ball rolling! And what are we to say about 'the vacant ground being occupied by persuasive appeals addressed to the heart rather than to the intellect, and calculated to humble rather than flatter the pride of human reason'? Why, the constant and very just complaint against the theology of the eighteenth century, apart from Methodism, was that it was addressed *not* to the heart, but to the head, and that the reason was so exalted that the age might justly be termed 'Sæculum Rationalisticum.' Mr. Mozley then falls foul of the Church Catechism and the Litany. The former appears to be as great a 'crux' to him as it might be to a Particular Baptist. It is 'a miserable débris'; it reminds him of 'the great Egyptian god Amen' (p. 273); it ignores the one perfect example of our duty to God and man, Jesus Christ (p. 275). As to the Litany, we would say to Mr. Mozley what, no doubt, as a parish priest, he has often said to the children of his parish school: 'Mind your steps.'

The first invocation is not 'O God, the Father of Heaven,' but 'O God the Father, of Heaven.' This simple correction will answer Mr. Mozley's first objection. But it is painful to go further. An old proverb tells us 'it is an ill bird that fouls its own nest.' Mr. Mozley has been for sixty years in holy orders; for the greater part of that time he has been eating the bread of the Church of England. Surely then that Church may be regarded as his nest; and if such a passage as the following is not fouling that nest, we do not know what is:

'For three centuries the Established Church of this country has been struggling, with the aid of the civil power, and the still more terrible weapon of a social ban, to force on all classes, be they learned or simple, stoutly resistant, or meekly compliant, her own special explanation of the so-called Trinity. For the greater part of the present century her quarrel with the British public on this point, and this alone, has been year after year more and more bitter and more desperate. The more hopeless the contention, and the more miserable the consequences, the more has the Established Church avoided coming to what may be called close quarters as to the sense of her favourite dogma. In fact not a single theologian of any note has ventured to present himself as its champion and exponent' (p. 278).

Poor Church of England! Well, she may forgive Mr. Mozley his hard words about her in consideration of the service he has done to the truth which she is bound to guard, in the earlier part of this very volume.

Sermons Preached in Lincoln's Inn Chapel. By F. D. MAURICE, in Six Volumes. Vols. i. and ii. New Edition. (London: Macmillan and Co., 1891.)

THE call for a new edition of Mr. Maurice's Lincoln's Inn sermons may be taken as an indication that the influence of that remarkable man has not died out. He did not, indeed, as once seemed probable, found any new school of theology, but his tone of thought has more or less affected all schools. This, more than any definite teaching, seems to us to be the character of Mr. Maurice's influence. For, as far as definite teaching is concerned, we must frankly confess that we can often not quite tell what he is aiming at. This is the more provoking because he writes in an admirable style, is sometimes very suggestive, and has plenty of fire and earnestness. Some of the sermons of which we *can* catch the drift, seem to us remarkably good; for instance, the sermon for the Fourth Sunday after Trinity, which treats a well-worn subject in a striking, original, and very practical way. *O si sic omnia!* The sermons in these two volumes follow the course of the Christian year, beginning with Advent, and ending with the Twenty-fourth Sunday after Trinity, some Sundays being omitted. In such a course one would naturally expect to find some distinct teaching about the Christian seasons; but the Advent sermons do not appear to deal particularly with the special lessons of Advent, nor the Lenten sermons with those of Lent, nor the Easter sermons with those of Eastertide; oddly enough, Easter Day is one of the Sundays left out. Again, one naturally wishes to

know what are the views of so eminent a Christian leader on the Christian Sacraments, but it is very difficult to ascertain. There is no special sermon on Holy Baptism, but we naturally turn to one on the text 'For if we have been planted in the likeness of His death,' &c. (Rom. vi. 5), a text which obviously refers to that Sacrament, as commentators who take the lowest Sacramental views, such as Adam Clark and Thomas Scott, fully admit; but Mr. Maurice seems to apply it to something else, though what that something is we really cannot quite say. We desire to know what are his views about the Holy Eucharist; here surely we shall not be disappointed, for the first five sermons are expressly on the subject. The preacher connects the teaching of Advent, to which he adds that of Holy Innocents' Day, with the subject of Holy Communion. But having read the five sermons carefully we cannot for the life of us make out what his views precisely are. He touches upon a subject which was very forcibly worked out some years before his time by Bishop Jebb—the Sacramental character of Holy Scripture; but no one can mistake what Bishop Jebb means in his two sermons, say, on the Tree of Life and the Tree of Knowledge of Good and Evil, whereas Mr. Maurice's sermon on the Epistle for the second Sunday in Advent seems in one sentence to be following the same lines, in another quite different ones. You seem to be catching his meaning, and then, Proteus-like, he eludes your grasp. This at least has been *our* experience. It may be from some mental defect, but we find ourselves constantly sympathizing with Gilead Beck in *The Golden Butterfly*, when he attempted in vain to understand Robert Browning's poetry. The words seemed simple and intelligible, but they conveyed no consecutive meaning to him. Just so with Mr. Maurice. His language is simplicity itself, but the general drift of it is beyond us. Such being the case any attempt to review in detail the sermons before us must be given up as a perfectly hopeless task, and we can only hope that the readers of them (who will, we have no doubt, be many) may be more successful than ourselves.

The History of My Life: an Autobiography. By the Right Rev.

ASHTON OXENDEN, formerly Bishop of Montreal, and Metropolitan of Canada. (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1891.)

To students of Church history there is no class of literature more valuable than the autobiographies which, in one shape or another, many eminent Churchmen have left behind them. There you have, so to speak, history at first hand. Instead of learning the events of the past through an intervening medium you learn them from one who can say *quorum pars magna fui*. In this way the bright little sketch of his own long life, which the venerable Bishop Oxenden has been good enough to give to the public, will probably be more valuable a hundred years hence than it is now, especially as he does not discuss the outside history of the great events, ecclesiastical and civil, amidst which he has lived, but simply gives us his own personal experiences. We have seen his autobiography blamed because he *does* thus limit himself. But the future ecclesiastical historian will be grateful to him

for doing so. It will not be particularly interesting to posterity to know what Bishop Oxenden thought of the Gorham question, or the Colenso question, or the Ritual question; for, to tell the truth, his sentiments on such subjects would probably be rather vague and vapid; but the story of his life in his own parish and in his own diocese will throw many a side-light upon the by-paths of history. What may seem to us mere matters of course will in many cases be interesting pieces of information, not easily attainable, to our posterity. In this way Pepys' *Diary* is infinitely more important to the historian of the seventeenth century than Evelyn's, and Bishop Newton's autobiography worth a hundred of the journals in which good men were wont to chronicle their spiritual experiences, to the historian of the eighteenth. But we must think of ourselves rather than of our posterity; and regarded in this light, too, the little volume before us is interesting. Bishop Oxenden belongs to a class which, we hope, will never cease to send recruits to the Christian Ministry. He is the younger son of a baronet and country gentleman in Kent, and was educated at Harrow and Oxford. He gives the same account that everybody else does of the unsatisfactory state of the religious training, both at public schools and at the universities, in the early days of the present century; and it would be well if the *laudator temporis acti, se puero*, who loves to find fault with the educational system of the present day would meditate on the experiences of Bishop Oxenden and others of the past. His first curacy was that of his native parish, Barham, and the study of this part of his story, too, would be useful to the pessimists who make light of the improvements in Church matters which the present generation has witnessed. Bishop Oxenden has evidently a sense of humour, which appears in two capital stories which he tells of his Oxford life. He was in those early days (tell it not in Gath!) fond of hunting, and at the end of one winter term the Dean of University College—the Bishop mentions no name, but surely we recognize in his description the excellent Dr. Plumtree, *alias* 'Old Plum'?—called him to account, and begged him 'at any rate to promise that he would not hunt during the next term.' The promise could be, and was, safely given, for the next term was the May term, when hunting was not exactly in season! He became a candidate for a Fellowship at All Souls, where social qualifications counted for at least as much as intellectual ones. He was invited to dine with the Fellows, and, being a gentleman born and bred, of course passed through that ordeal satisfactorily; but, unfortunately, after dinner he was asked to take a hand at whist, and being naturally in a state of nervous trepidation, he made a terrible revoke! Whether this had anything to do with his rejection he does not commit himself so far as to say. Into the details of his work at Barham, at Pluckley, and in Canada as Bishop of Montreal and Metropolitan, though his account of each, and especially of the last, contains interesting matter, space forbids us to enter. But there is one topic on which much more might have been told than the Bishop has told us, with great advantage. He has been perhaps the most successful author in the present age of religious works which appeal alike to the lettered and the unlettered reader,

but especially to the latter. We have a brief—far too brief—and modest account of the composition of the *Pathway of Safety*, and one or two other works. But we should like to have known more about the production of his literary work than we can learn from this volume, and would venture to suggest that in the next edition the Bishop might give us a whole chapter about the composition of his extremely popular religious works, which, though rather too colourless for our taste, are at any rate important on the principle that ‘nothing succeeds like success’; for it would teach future religious writers how the ear of the public was gained by one who, like themselves, desired to impress the first of all duties upon his readers.

Dr. Liddon's Tour in Egypt and Palestine in 1886. Being Letters descriptive of the Tour, written by his Sister, Mrs. KING. (London : Longmans, Green, and Co., 1891.)

THE main interest of this little book lies in the fact that it is Dr. Liddon's tour that is described. But anything we can learn about Dr. Liddon has an interest of its own; and we only wish that Mrs. King could have told us more about her distinguished brother. We learn that he took, as might have been expected, a deep and intelligent interest in all the associations, especially the religious associations, of the places which he visited; that he was fond of taking sketches; that he was not at all nervous about running the risks to which adventurous travellers in the East are necessarily exposed; that he wanted to see everything that could be seen; that he found no relaxation in mere rest; and that his sister was frequently apprehensive lest he should over-task his delicate frame. We learn also that he had to pay the usual penalty of greatness, and fled, whenever he could, from Cairo, because he was constantly besieged with friends and visitors there; and finally, we have a most interesting account of his reception of the offer of the bishopric of Edinburgh, which, as anyone who knew the man might have expected, he evidently regarded as a great honour to himself, instead of its being, as it would have been, a great honour to Edinburgh if he could have seen his way to accepting it. There is, perhaps, nothing very novel in the incidents of travel which Mrs. King records; but there will, no doubt, be many who will be glad to have ‘a fair daily report of how’ so great and good a man as Dr. Liddon ‘passed his time in the one long holiday which he allowed himself’—or, rather, which was forced upon him by ‘his medical advisers’—‘in his life of serious work’ (Preface).

The Golden Censer. Being a selection from the Prayers of the Saints, A.D. 69–1890. With Notes and Indices by Mrs. EDWARD LIDDELL. (London : Longmans, Green, and Co., 1891.)

THIS is an interesting little collection of short prayers and ejaculations, 120 in number, from St. Polycarp down to the present day. They are well selected, and the proportion taken from each writer seems to us on the whole judicious. We have five pages given to St. Augustine, seven to Thomas à Kempis, eight to Lancelot Andrewes, five to John Cosin, eight to Jeremy Taylor, five to Thomas Ken; while the

remaining thirty-seven writers have each a smaller space allotted to them. This may not represent the relative greatness of the names taken generally, but it does fairly represent them in connexion with the prayers they wrote, except that, perhaps, a little more space might have been given to St. Augustine. A few names connected with the composition of prayers are conspicuous by their absence—notably those of St. Chrysostom, Archbishop Laud, John Kettlewell, and Robert Nelson; and a few are included which we should have hardly expected to find among prayer-writers—such as Thomas Hood and Robert Browning. In her notes Mrs. Liddell gives us brief and, on the whole, satisfactory biographies of the writers; but surely the notice of Thomas Sherlock, in connexion with the life of his father, William Sherlock, is misleading. He is described as 'Dean of Chichester and Bishop of Bangor and Salisbury, who died in 1761, and who was likewise an author.' Thomas Sherlock died Bishop of London, having been a very prominent bishop of that important see for thirteen years; he was also, like his father, Master of the Temple. The expression 'who was likewise an author' hardly does justice to the very able writer of 'The Tryal of the Witnesses' and other important works. He was, in fact, an abler and more consistent man than his father had been. Again, 'probably the greatest poetess of all time' is a strong expression even about that very beautiful writer Elizabeth Barrett Browning. But this is a matter of taste.

Happiness in the Spiritual Life: or, the Secret of the Lord. A Series of Practical Considerations. By the Rev. W. C. INGRAM. (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1891.)

We will frankly own that we took up this volume somewhat doubtfully. The title seemed a very general one; the name of the author was not known to us; the circumstances of the publication did not reassure us. A set of addresses delivered at special services might be very good for the purpose for which they were intended, but it frequently happens that what is most effective when delivered orally, will not bear the test of being read in cold blood; the desire of friends to see in print what they have listened to with pleasure and profit has often led a good preacher to transmute himself into a bad writer. We feared that we were going to be placed in that most embarrassing situation of having to criticize a book which the obviously good intention of the author would prevent us from abusing, but which a stern sense of duty would prevent us from praising. But as soon as we began to read, our doubts were speedily dispelled. Strong, vigorous thoughts expressed in a pure, terse style, and with studied simplicity, a thorough working-out of the subject in hand without any digressions, great spiritual earnestness, a sound Church tone, and, what is by no means universal in this species of composition, a strong tincture of plain, common sense—such are the chief merits of these very striking addresses. 'The spiritual life' is defined as 'the ordinary daily life lived in union with our Blessed Lord, Jesus Christ;' and the writer shows in turn what is the nature of the happiness of such a life, how it is lost and

how it is regained, its helps and hindrances, its resolutions and its responsibilities, concluding with the Scriptural example of King David. There is such a *general* level of excellence throughout the work, and the thread of the argument is so closely followed, that an extract cannot be selected without doing the writer injustice. We must, therefore, be content with recommending the book generally, but most strongly, to all thoughtful readers.

Life inside the Church of Rome. By M. FRANCIS CLARE CUSACK, 'the Nun of Kenmare.' (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1889.)

It cannot be said that this book makes pleasant reading. It ought not to be pleasant to anyone to read an unmeasured invective against a great branch of the Church of Christ; and such this volume is. At the same time it is hard for anyone who has not special knowledge on the subject to contravene the statements of one who has had practical and intimate acquaintance with it. 'The Nun of Kenmare' attacks the Roman Church alike for the vicious lives of its priests and leaders and for the false and pernicious teaching which it propagates. No doubt there is foundation for the former, but it is startling to find the affirmation, repeated more than once, that 'he is a bold man who would deny that priests are intemperate as a class;' and intemperance is not the only sin that is laid to their charge, and supported by concrete instances within the experience of the writer. There may be—nay, there unquestionably is—another side to the matter; but it cannot be denied that this volume makes out a strong indictment against the priesthood of the Church of Rome, at any rate in the country from which the authoress's experience is drawn. As to the second charge, the false teaching on matters of history and doctrine, one need feel less hesitation, though some of the quotations from Roman books of instruction are certainly astounding. It has always been known that Rome withholds from its members that intimate acquaintance with the Bible in their native tongue which is the great stronghold of the English Church, and that it emphatically discourages historical inquiry into the facts relative to the establishment and constitution of its system, especially the supremacy of the Papacy. These charges have been often made with greater profundity and ability, though hardly with more bitterness, than they are in the present volume. Those persons who are inclined to look on the Roman system as having great advantages which are denied to ourselves may do well to turn to this book to see what there is to be said on the other side—not for a reasoned examination of the differences between the Churches, but for a vigorous, though diffuse and ill-arranged, exposure of certain great evils which are evident upon the surface. As a warning against false ideas of what Roman supremacy would mean such a volume may do good; but, as we said at first, it is not pleasant reading.

Mirabilia Urbis Romæ: the Marvels of Rome, or a Picture of the Golden City. An English Version of the Medieval Guide-book, with a Supplement of Illustrative Matter and Notes. By FRANCIS MORGAN NICHOLS. (London: Ellis and Elvey. Rome: Spithoever. 1889.)

THE *Mirabilia Urbis Romæ* is by far the best known and most useful of the mediæval descriptions of Rome. It was written, as Mr. Nichols's clear and compact preface shows, in the second half of the twelfth century. It circulated largely in manuscript; it was revised and enlarged under the title of *Graphia Aurea Urbis Romæ*, and after the invention of printing it ran through many editions before its popularity was exhausted. It was the standard guide-book of the end of the Middle Age, the Murray and Baedeker of the pilgrims and travellers who made their way to the ancient and holy city. Nor did it confine itself to a mere enumeration of the buildings and antiquities to be found within the walls of Rome; for it enlivens the journey of the sightseer, and sustains his interest in the objects described to him, by narrating, in the simplest and most unsuspecting manner, the legends which had accumulated round the various antiquities. Here is a specimen—one of the shortest, but not the best:—

'In *Cannapara* is the temple of Ceres and Tellus, with two courts or houses, adorned all round with porches resting upon pillars, so that whosoever sat therein to give judgment was seen from every side. Fast by that house was the palace of Catiline, where was a church of St. Antony; nigh whereunto is a place that is called Hell, because of old time it burst forth there, and brought great mischief upon Rome; where a certain noble knight, to the intent that the city should be delivered after the responses of their gods, did on his harness and cast himself into the pit, and the earth closed; so the city was delivered. There is the temple of Vesta, where it is said that a dragon coucheth below, as we read in the life of St. Silvester.'

Such a volume not merely has an interest as a quaint relic of the thoughts of our forefathers, but also is of value to the antiquary and historian for the information which it contains as to the position of buildings or of works of art which have since been lost. In this direction it has long been recognized as a useful authority on Roman topography; and for this reason, as well as for its quaint legends and distortions of history, it deserves to be offered to English readers in an English dress. Mr. Nichols has, so far as we have seen, done his work well. His translation preserves well the tone and colour of the original, his notes are clear and instructive, and he has added much interesting additional matter, such as the *Marvels of Roman Churches*, a collection of a similar description to the *Mirabilia*, and found with it in an early manuscript of the latter. A good reproduction is given of a plan of Rome about the year 1475. Finally, the book is well printed on good paper, and prettily bound. Altogether it is a volume which no lover of mediæval thoughts and stories need regret either reading or buying.

INDEX TO VOL. XXXIII.

APU

A PUBLISHER and his Friends (review of Dr. Smiles's *Memoir of John Murray*), 185 *sqq.*; scope of the work, 186; a mixed company, 187; John Murray's father, *ib.*; young Murray's first step in business, 188; difficulties of the trade, *ib.*; his early friendships with literary men, 189; marriage, 190; relations with Constable and Hunter, *ib.*; Murray's good business qualities, 191; brought into contact with Walter Scott, 192; the launching of the *Quarterly Review*, 193; its first editor, Gifford, 194; its early difficulties, 195; Murray's introduction to Lord Byron, *ib.*; great success of his works, 196; the *Ode to Napoleon*, 197; Murray called the 'Emperor of the West,' 198; his drawing-room a literary centre, 199; the *Quarterly*, the *Edinburgh*, and the battle of Waterloo, 199; *Don Juan*, 199 *sq.*; Byron's *Memoirs*, 201; varying fortunes of the *Quarterly*, 202; Benjamin Disraeli, *ib.*; failure of *The Representative*, 203; ill health, *ib.*; great works published by Murray, 204; his objection to personalities in literary criticism, *ib.*; his generosity, 205; service done by the *Quarterly Review* to literature and to the country, 205

BELLESHEIM, Rev. Canon, *History of the Catholic Church of Scotland*, vols. iii. iv., 246
Bousfield, Mr. W., *Elementary*
VOL. XXXIII.—NO. LXVI.

CHU

Schools: how to Increase their Utility, 261
Boys, Mr. C. V., *Soap-Bubbles, &c.*, 269
Bright, Rev. Canon, *The Incarnation as a Motive Power*, 529

CHRISTIANITY and Morals (review of Rev. H. Hughes's *Principles of Natural and Supernatural Morals*), 136 *sqq.*; difficulties about the title of the book, 136; its division of Pagan, Jewish, and Christian morals, 137; the desire of happiness is, after all, supernatural, 138; so of the 'constraint of order,' 139; the effect of the 'new birth' on Christians, 140; the poverty of motive which operates in the less-instructed stages of human history, 141; the influence of 'self,' *ib.*; Christianity did not produce a new science of morals, 142; Mr. Hughes's theory that 'Christian morals presuppose in the Christian higher moral capabilities' than in the non-Christian, *ib.*; his theory of the date of the 'new birth' (Christianity), 143; of three kinds of will, 144; of the consequences of sin, 145; estimate of Mr. Hughes's work, 146
Church Missionary Society and Proselytism, the, 492 *sqq.*; the history of the 'Jerusalem Bishopric,' 492; the consecration of Bishop Blyth, 493; the Archbishop of Canterbury's Letter to the Patriarch of Antioch, 494; its limitation of the Bishop's

N N

CLA

work to the oversight of the English clergy and congregations, *ib.*; the 'history behind' this, 495; the Bishop in collision with the Church Missionary Society, 496; the Archbishop's award on the dispute, *ib.*; the Society's defence of its position, 497; both sides shirk a definition of 'prose-lytism,' *ib.*; the Society's account of its methods, 498; a subtle distinction, 499; antagonism of the Archbishop's letter and the Society's methods, 500; the result of this case is a further justification of those opposed to the 'Jerusalem Bishopric,' 502

Classical Studies, the Progress of (review of Dr. Smith's *Dictionary of Greek and Roman Antiquities*), 477 *sqq.*; stages of growth of classical studies, 478; archaeological and historical study now added to the literary study of antiquity, *ib.*; the first edition of Dr. Smith's work (1842), 479; the third edition (1890-91), 480; advantages and disadvantages of the alphabetical arrangement, 481; serious omissions in this edition, 482; careless editing, 483; extent of the changes in the new edition, 485; the articles on the Roman Constitution and its details, 484; those on Greek history, 486; the archaeological articles, 487; smaller works of art, 489; articles illustrating the history of religion, 491; minor subjects, *ib.*

Corbett, Mr. J., *Sir Francis Drake*, 265

Curate of Rigg, The (by W. H. H.), 266

Cusack, Miss, *Life inside the Church of Rome*, 543

DRIVER, Rev. Canon, *An Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament*, 341 *sqq.*; increasing interest in the question of the 'higher criticism,' 341; object and method of Canon Driver's book, 343; theory of the 'Hexateuch,' 344; dangers of hypothe-

ELI

tical reconstruction of documents, 345; Astruc's theories, 346; enlargement and development in Germany, 346 *sqq.*; the 'Jehovist' and (two) 'Elohists' narratives, 348; comparison of Canon Driver's and Dillmann's arrangement of the 'Priestly Narrative' in Genesis, 349 *n.*; the estimate of 'linguistic peculiarities,' 350; inquiry into the alleged scientific character of the methods of the 'higher criticism,' 351; its basis is, not demonstration, but authority of critics, 352 *sqq.*; Canon Driver's investigation of the phraseology of the Hexateuch, 354 *n.*; comparison of literary investigation in other works than the Bible, 355; the canons of historic investigation followed by Canon Driver, 356; recklessness of statement occasionally found in the 'higher criticism,' 359; the arguments for the later origin of the 'Priestly Narrative,' 361; linguistic arguments, 362 *sqq.*; reverence of tone with which Canon Driver writes, 365; Professor Klostermann's *Neue kirchliche Zeitschrift*, 366; summary of conclusions on the 'higher criticism,' 367

ELIZABETHAN Explorers, 216 *sqq.*; importance of the Reformation period to English history, 216; changed position of England after the breach with the Papacy, 217; religious causes of the decline of the fishing industry, *ib.*; new paths of commerce opened up, 218; the four great ocean routes, 219; peculiarity of the trade with the East, the Cape, and the islands of the Southern Seas, *ib.*; the attractions of the West Indies and the 'Spanish Main,' 220; expeditions to the coast of Guinea, *ib.*; beginnings of the slave trade, 221; John Hawkins's ventures, *ib.*; vast profits gained, 222; Francis Drake's voyage round the globe, 223; his plunder of

ELL

silver from the Spaniards, 224 *sq.*; clever capture of the 'Cacafuego,' 226; Drake's route back to England, 228; enthusiastic reception at home, 229; enormous profits of the expedition, 230; John Cabot's expedition (1497), 231; Martin Frobisher, *ib.*; Sir Humphrey Gilbert, 232; question of a 'north-west passage': Captain John Davies, 233; whaling voyages, *ib.*; William Baffin, *ib.*; Henry Hudson, 234; continued ardour for Arctic exploration, 235

Ellicott, Bishop, on Old Testament criticism (review of his *Christus Comprobator*), 307 *sqq.*; early Christian view of the authorship of the Hebrew books, 307; opinions on the Pentateuch: Aben Ezra, Maseas, Hobbes and Spinoza, Dr. Astruc, 308; theories on the authorship of the Psalms and of Isaiah, *ib.*; Kuenen, Wellhausen, Cheyne, Driver, 309; Mr. Gore's essay (*Lux Mundi*), 310; need of critical study of the Old Testament from the Christian point of view, 312; Bishop Ellicott's statement of the 'traditional view,' 312 *sqq.*; Dr. Edersheim's opinion, 314; Dr. Liddon on the method of 'selection,' 315; Bishop Ellicott's presentation of the 'analytical theory,' 315; his comparison of the attitude of Dr. Driver and Mr. Gore with that theory, 316; consideration of the relative probability of the two theories, 317; and of leading objections against the traditional view in its 'rectified form,' 319; difficulties in the way of acceptance of the analytical theory, 320; the bearing of the teaching of our Lord on Old Testament criticism, 321; a statement of critical work which calls for research, 322

England in the Eighteenth Century (review of Mr. W. C. Sydney's work), 467 *sqq.*; two estimates contrasted, 467; one-sidedness of Mr. Sydney, 469; some correctives

FAR

to his statements: Education: Charity Schools, 470; spread of knowledge among the lower classes, 471; dame schools and Sunday schools, *ib.*; work done by the clergy and by grammar schools: Public Schools, 472; the Literary World: the century produced the very best specimens of work in many departments, 473; evidence in Mr. Sydney's own book that there was no lack of mental culture, 474; the Political World: the century produced our greatest statesmen and orators, *ib.*; the Religious World: the brighter side, which Mr. Sydney neglects, 475; many inaccuracies in his work, 476

Ephesus, the Council of, 91 *sqq.*; information on the interior history of Councils a desideratum, 92; account of an unpublished Coptic MS. on the Council of Ephesus, 93; its genuineness, 94; its writer, Victor, acting at the Imperial Court as agent of Cyril of Alexandria, 94; Cyril's instructions to Victor, 96; the latter's interviews with the Emperor Theodosius, 97; the Emperor's letter to the bishops, 98; Cyril's account of the preliminary disputes, 99; a memorial sent to the Emperor, 100; Count Candidian, the Emperor's agent, at Ephesus, 101; his treatment of Cyril's party, 102; and amicable relations with Nestorius, 103; procrastination, 104; Victor's urgency with the Emperor, 105; Theodosius declares the first session of the Council illegal, 107; the excommunication of Nestorius, *ib.*; a letter of Cyril's explaining the position of the Council, 109; popular excitement in Constantinople, *ib.*; the people demand to have the Acts of the Council read to them, 111; uproarious enthusiasm, 113; appreciation of the value of the MS., 114

FARRER, Mr. J. A., *Paganism and Christianity*, 520

GIF

GIFFORD, Rev. Dr., *The Authorship of the 110th Psalm*, 530

Gore's *Bampton Lectures*, 273 *sqq.*; the Incarnation regarded as the Divine answer to human need, 273; it creates the possibility of Sacraments, 275; is a sufficient answer to the problems involved in the toleration of evil and pain, 277; Would there have been no Incarnation if there had been no sin? 278; statement of the doctrine of the Incarnation, 279; Christ's impeccability does not lessen His human sympathy, 281; contents of Mr. Gore's lectures: the 'distinguishing characteristic' of Christianity, 283; position of our Lord as 'a supernatural person,' *ib.*; historical testimony about our Lord, 284; the dogmatic decisions of the Church on the Incarnation, 285; the revelation of God in Christ, 286; Christ as 'the revelation of manhood,' *ib.*; teaching of the Gospels on the human knowledge of our Lord, 286 *sqq.*; authority in religion, 289; high standard of life set before us by Christ, 290; appreciation of the lectures, 291; excellence of the practical portions no less than of the dogmatic, 292; defects: no adequate representation of the authority of the Church, 293; nor of the positive usefulness of dogmatic decisions, 294; tendency to confuse the real distinction between the natural and the supernatural, 295; the description of the Incarnation as 'the legitimate climax of natural development,' 296; criticism of Mr. Gore's views of our Lord's human knowledge, 297; exegesis of the Scriptural passages involved, 298; the argument that our Lord 'never enlarges our stock of natural knowledge,' 300; explanation of St. Luke ii. 52, *ib.*; St. Mark xiii. 32, 301; of *ἐάντων ἐκένωσεν*, 302; Mr. Gore's opinion that our Lord's teaching has no bearing

HUM

on particular questions of Old Testament criticism, 303; benefits of a modified use of the Scholastic method of teaching Christian doctrine, 304; a great treatise on Dogmatic Theology a desideratum of our time, 305; high value of Mr. Gore's work, 306

Gospel Chronology, Patristic evidence and, 390 *sqq.*; value of Browne's *Ordo Saeculorum*, 390; independent evidence for the date of the Crucifixion, 391; relation of the Passover to the month Nisan, 392; the remarkable eclipse of Olymp. 202, 4, 394; early Christian tradition as to the date of the Crucifixion, 395; statement of the *Acta Pilati*, 396; the evidence for the date A.D. 29, 397; the duration of Christ's public ministry, 400; Irenæus' opinion as to Christ's age, *ib.*; notes of time in St. John's Gospel, 402; patristic testimony as to these, 403; 'a feast' or 'the feast' (St. John v. 1)? 405; Eusebius' estimate of the length of Christ's ministry, 406; early theory limiting it to one year, 407; Origen's opinion, 409; the date of the commencement of Christ's ministry: the means of finding the date of the Nativity, 410; date of the building of Herod's Temple, 412; that of the beginning of the Baptist's ministry, 413; difficulty arising from the numeration of the regnal years of Tiberius, 413

HAFLIDASON, Einar, *The Life of Laurence, Bishop of Hölar* (trans. Mr. O. Elton), 260

Harrison, Rev. A. J., *Problems of Christianity and Scepticism*, 524

Howell, Mr. G., *Trade Unionism, New and Old*, 267

Humphry, Rev. W. G., *A Commentary on the Revised Version of the New Testament*, 259

ING

INGRAM, Rev. W. C., *Happiness in the Spiritual Life*, 542
Inheritance of the Saints, The (by L. P.), 271

JENNY LIND (review of Canon Scott Holland and Mr. Rockstro's *Memoir*), 65 *sqq.*; the charm of her character, 66; character of the *Memoir*, 67; her birth, early years, and musical training, 69; first operatic success, 70; her feeling of spiritual responsibility for her talent, 71; training in Paris under Garcia, 72; return to Sweden, 73; friendship with Hans Andersen, 74; introduced by Meyerbeer to Berlin, 75; friendship with Mendelssohn, 76; success at Vienna, 77; Mendelssohn causes her to take an engagement in London, 79; difficulty with Mr. Bunn, 80; enthusiastic reception, 81; visit to Norwich, 82; second visit to England, 84; tour through the provinces, 85; foundation of the Mendelssohn Scholarship, *ib.*; her last appearance on the stage, 86; projects of marriage, 87; her affectionate memory of Mendelssohn, 88; introduction to Otto Goldschmidt, *ib.*; the American tour with Barnum, 89; devotion of her earnings to charitable objects, *ib.*; marriage to Otto Goldschmidt, 90; happiness of her later life, 91

KEATS, the Letters of, 169 *sqq.*; value of the 'letters' of literary men, 169; general estimate of those of Keats, 172; Mr. Colvin's suppression of the letters to Fanny Brawne, 171; the tenor of Keats's correspondence, *ib.*; insight into his character afforded therein, 172; manifestation of his generous and affectionate disposition, 173; his dislike of his Christian name (John), 174; precocity of his genius, *ib.*; his first published volume, 175; his reaction against the style of Pope,

LIN

176; *Endymion*, 177; its shortcomings, 178; the attacks on it by the *Quarterly* and *Blackwood*, 179; Keats's own opinion of these, 180; character of his second volume of poems, 180 *sq.*; his last volume, 181; *Hyperion*, 182; Keats's passionate love of beauty, 183; an artist in language, *ib.*; Shelley's panegyric of Keats, 185
 King, Mrs., *Dr. Liddon's Tour in Egypt*, &c., 541
 Kingsley, Rev. Canon, *Westminster Sermons*, &c., 256
 Kirkpatrick, Rev. Professor, *The Divine Library of the Old Testament*, 505
 Knox Little, Rev. Canon, *The Christian Home*, 251

LECHMERE, Katharine Lady, *A Synopsis of the Daily Prayers, the Liturgy and Principal Offices of the Greek Orthodox Church*, 269
 Liddell, Mrs. Edward, *The Golden Censer*, 541
 Liddon, Rev. Canon, *Passiontide Sermons and Sermons on Old Testament Subjects*, 530
 Lightfoot, Bishop, *The Apostolic Fathers*, 235
 Lincoln, the County and Diocese of, 147 *sqq.*; mistaken popular estimate of Lincolnshire, 147; its 'parts,' 'thirdings,' or 'ridings,' 148; Lindsey: Fulbeck, Grant-ham, 149; featureless character of the seaboard, 150; the Trent and Humber shores, 151; Twigg-moor, 152; parish churches, 153; towers, 154; Thornton Abbey, &c., 154 *sq.*; castles, 155; early ecclesiastical annals of the county, 156; St. Paulinus, 156 *sq.*; St. Chad, 158; St. Higbald, 159; Bardney: St. Oswald, *ib.*; St. Botulf's town (Boston), 161; Crowland, *ib.*; history of the bishopric of Lincoln, 161 *sqq.*; Bishops: Eadhed, Ethelwin, Rémy (Remigius), 162; Bloet, Alexander 'the Magnificent,' St. Hugh, 163; Grosseteste, William

MAU

of Alnwick, Wolsey, Longland, 164; William Barlow, Richard Neile, George Mountaigne, 165; Lord-Keeper Williams, Robert Sanderson, Thomas Barlow, 166; Tenison, Wake, Gibson, Reynolds, John Thomas, 167; John Green, Thurlow, Pretymen (Tomline), Manners Sutton, Pelham, Kaye, Jackson, Wordsworth, 168

MAURICE, Rev. F. D., *Sermons preached in Lincoln's Inn Chapel*, 538

Mirabilia Urbis Romæ (trans. Mr. Nichols), 544

Moore, Rev. Canon A. L., *Lectures on the Reformation in England*, &c., 243

Moorhouse, Bishop, *Dangers of the Apostolic Age*, 237

Moule, Ven. Archdeacon, *Reasons for the Hope that is in us*, 522

Mozley, Rev. T., *Letters from Rome*, 206 *sqq.*; a view of the Vatican Council from a new standpoint, 207; contrast between expectations and results of the Council, 208; Mr. Mozley's position towards the Roman Church, 209; his demur to this gathering being called a Council, 210; its 'deliberations' were on foregone conclusions, 211; position of Bishop Dupanloup and the German bishops, *ib.*; the extensive opposition to the Infallibility dogma, 212; extraordinary result shown in the voting, *ib.*; influence of the personality of Pius IX., *ib.*; Montalembert's dying protest, 214; other matters of interest in Mr. Mozley's work, 215

— *The Son*, 534

NATURAL RELIGION, recent works on, 323 *sqq.*; difficulty of defining 'natural' religion, 323; religion implies belief in a living supernatural agency, 325; M. de la Saussaye's theories, *ib.*; Prof. Max Müller's theory of the identity of language and thought, 326; his treatment of the ques-

OUR

tion, What is religion? 327; the original meaning of the word, 328; Dr. Martineau's definition, *ib.*; Cardinal Newman's theory that conscience is the religious organ of the soul, 329; summary of Max Müller's reasoning, 330; he ignores the religious impulses of mankind, 331; his final definition of religion criticised, 332; M. de la Saussaye's definition, 333; his treatment of the connexion between religion and morality, *ib.*; worth of history in the study of Natural Religion, 334; the religion of savages, 335; difficulty of comprehending Professor Max Müller's 'Natural Religion,' 336; Sir G. G. Stokes's *Natural Theology*, 338; Dr. Hettinger's *Natural Religion*, 339

Newnham, Rev. W. O., *Alresford Essays for the Times*, 509

OMAN, Mr. C. W., *Warwick the Kingmaker*, 264

Oulton, Rev. R. C., *Mr. Gore's Essay in 'Lux Mundi' considered*, 519

Our Lord's Knowledge as Man, 1 *sqq.*; Mr. Swayne's work, 1; Luther's innovations on the doctrine of the Incarnation, 2; meaning of *communicatio idiomatum*, 4; other results of Lutheran innovation, 5; objections to the Catholic doctrine considered, 5; meaning of *ἐκείνοθεν ἐαυτὸν*, 7; the Personality of Christ, 10; statement of the question as to Christ's knowledge, 12; contrast between human knowledge and Divine: the former dependent on the senses, 14; is discursive, 16; knows only the outside of things, 17; Divine knowledge is an infinite intuition, 18; is complete at once from beginning to end, 20; penetrates the inmost essence of things, 21; inferences drawn from this contrast and applied to the Incarnate Word, 22; illustrated from His words and deeds, 23; St. Athanasius' distinction

OXE

between our Lord's knowledge as God and His knowledge as man, 23; the effect which the infinite fulness of Divine knowledge must have had upon Christ's human knowledge, 25; the alleged fallibility of Christ; Bishop Colenso's statements criticised, 25; exegesis of St. Luke, ii. 52, 28; and of St. Mark, xiii. 32, 29
 Oxenden, Bishop (Montreal), *The History of my Life*, 539

POTTS, Rev. Dr., *School Sermons*, 248

SHANN, Mr. G. V., *Euchology*, 269

Shorthouse, Mr. J. H., *Blanche, Lady Falaise*, 526

Slevin, Mr. T. J., *Order in the Physical World*, 257

Smith, Rev. J. G., and Grundy, Rev. W., *Aristotelianism*, 262

Spanish Calendar (1538-1542), the, 415 *sqq.*; comparatively recent removal of difficulty of access to State papers, 415; value of the Rolls Series, 416; history of the issue of the Spanish Calendar, 417; events of the period covered by the new volume, 418; examples of miserable style of editing, 421; various matrimonial projects reported, 422; account of the career of Anne of Cleves in England, 423; rumours of her possible re-marriage with Henry VIII., 424; further examples of slipshod editing, 425; project of marriage of Princess Mary with the Duke of Bavaria, 426; preparations for a General Council, 427; Chapuys' letters, 428; editorial blunders in dates and names, 429; suggested marriage of Princess Mary with the Emperor, 430; ambassadorial notions of honour, 431; Henry VIII.'s double game with France and the Emperor, 432; prominence of Pope Paul III. (Alessandro Farnese) in these despatches, 437; the manner in which he pushed the fortunes of

TAI

his children and the Farnese family, 438 *sq.*
 Stanley Leathes, Rev. Dr., *The Law in the Prophets*, 502
 Sterrett, Rev. Dr., *Reason and Authority in Religion*, 514
 Swift's Life and Writings, 440; difficult problems, 440; a chequered reputation, *ib.*; the Rev. J. Hay's *Swift: the Mystery of his Life and Love*, 441; Swift's early years and training, 442; he enters Sir William Temple's household, 443; takes Holy Orders, *ib.*; the *Tale of a Tub* and *Battle of the Books*, 444; the nature of his religious belief, 446; the *Argument against abolishing Christianity*, 447; *The Dissensions in Athens and Rome*, 448; Swift and Stella, *ib.*; he is brought into official relation with the Whig ministry, *ib.*; political change: his writings against the abolition of the Test, 449; his relations with Harley, *ib.*; his party ballads and lampoons, 450; self-revelation in the *Journal to Stella*, 451; examples of his generosity, 452; he is made Dean of St. Patrick's, 453; Stella and Vanessa, 454; Mr. Hay's theory on the cause of the rupture between Swift and Vanessa, 455; Swift's alleged marriage to Stella, 456; his theory about marriage, 457; examination of *Gulliver's Travels*, 457; Swift's hours of cynicism, 460; his *Draper Letters*, 461; his Irish policy, 462; the death of Stella, 463; gloom of Swift's later years, 464; advice on the treatment of a runaway daughter, 465; his friendships, 466; love for Pope, *ib.*

TAIT, Archbishop (review of his *Life* by Dean Davidson and Canon Benham), 30 *sqq.*; Tait's birth and early education, 31; University career, 32; position towards the Tractarians, 33; protest against Tract XC., 33; Tait appointed to Rugby, 35; Dean

WOR

of Carlisle, *ib.*; marriage, *ib.*; member of the Oxford University Commission, 36; the Report, 37; domestic sorrows, 39; Tait made Bishop of London, 40; principles on which he governed his diocese, 40; position in regard to Ritualism, 42; Mr. Liddell's Appeal, 44; Dr. Tait's views on confession, 45; other Ritualistic difficulties, 46; the Ritual Commission, 48; action of Convocation, 49; its Resolution and Report, 51; the Public Worship Regulation Act, 53; other ecclesiastical difficulties, 55; *Essays and Reviews*, 56; Bishop Colenso, 57; the Burials Bill, 59; the Athanasian Creed, 60; estimate of Dr. Tait as a statesman, 61; his practical work as a bishop, 62; the Bishop of London's Fund, 63; its excellent results, 64

WORDSWORTH, Bishop

Charles, *Annals of my Early Life*, 1806-1846, 372 *sqq.*; advantages and dangers of autobiography, 373; character of the present work, 374; Bishop Wordsworth's birth and early years, *ib.*; at Harrow, 375; anecdote of Canning, 376; life at Oxford, *ib.*; he and his two brothers win three prizes in one year, 377; athletic laurels, *ib.*; Dean Gaisford's laconism, 378; Wordsworth's Oxford friends and pupils, 379; Mr. Hope Scott, Mr. Gladstone, 380; the Parliamentary oratory of 1831, 380; a tour through Northern Europe, 382; Roundell Palmer (Lord Selborne), *ib.*; Wordsworth's marriage: death of his wife: epitaph on her tomb, 383; his career at Winchester, 384; beneficial work there: relations with Moberly, 385;

YON

Wordsworth's Greek Grammar, 385; second marriage: headmaster at Glenalmond, 387; remarks on the Oxford Movement, 388; weak points of the book, 388

Wyclif, John, 115 *sqq.*; various spellings of the name, 115; ancient and inveterate hostility to his memory in England, 116; in higher reputation on the Continent, 117; nothing known of his parentage or early years, 118; character of his Oxford education, 119; the then course of study for a Bachelor's degree, 120; for the Doctorate, 121; barrenness of the Scholastic method, 122; Wyclif's Realist treatment of the doctrines of the Incarnation and of the Eucharist, 123; he is deprived of the Wardenship of Canterbury Hall, 124; his first collision with the Papacy, 125; he sides with the popular anti-clerical feeling, 126; his ideal of Church Reform, 127; on the relation of Church and State, 128; accused of subverting the framework of society, 129; he throws off allegiance to the Papacy, 130; insists upon the sole authority of the Bible, *ib.*; development of his anti-Papal opinions, 131; attacks on the inhabitants of 'Caim's Castle' (the Mendicants), 131; desires complete separation from the Papacy, and to found a new Church, 133; his 'Poor Priests,' 134; translation of the Bible, *ib.*; his condemnation at the 'Earthquake' Council, *ib.*; his death, *ib.*; his extravagances and errors, 135

YONGE, Miss C. M., *Two Penniless Princesses*, 258

grammar,
head-
87; re-
vement,
e book,

various
15; an-
stility to
116; in
e Conti-
n of his
rs, 118;
educa-
urse of
degree,
e, 121;
stic me-
ist treat-
the In-
ucharist,
he War-
all, 124;
Papacy,
popular
26; his
127; on
nd State,
ting the
129; he
to the
pon the
ble, *ib.*;
nti-Papal
on the
Castle'
desires
rom the
l a new
Priests,'
Bible, *ib.*;
'Earth-
s death,
nd errors,

vo Penni-